EDUCATION AS A SOCIAL FACTOR

EDUCATION AS A SOCIAL FACTOR

BY

M. L. JACKS, M.A.

Headmaster of Mill Hill School

London

Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.

Broadway House : 68-74 Carter Lane, E.C.

First published 1937

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY HEADLEY BROTHERS
109 KINGSWAY, LONDON, W.C.2; AND ASHFORD, KENT

DEDICATED

TO

MY WIFE

CONTENTS

PREFACE

THE substance of this book is six lectures delivered in the Michaelmas term of 1936 at Manchester College, Oxford, under the Dunkin Trust for Lectures in Sociology. The alterations that have been made are mainly such as were rendered necessary by the substitution of the written for the spoken word, but they have been as few as possible. I am indebted to the authorities of the College for the invitation to deliver the lectures, and to the Trustees for permission to publish them. I gratefully acknowledge my debt to other writers, particularly to the books of Mr F. S. Marvin, Professor J. J. Findlay, and the volume entitled *Education for Citizenship*, published by the Clarendon Press. Where possible, I have given references: but I am conscious that I have often given expression to a borrowed thought, without recollecting the source from which I borrowed it: where that happens, I offer my apologies and my thanks. But my

deepest debt, and one that I can never repay, is owing to the Governors, the Masters, and the boys of Mill Hill School, who, during the fifteen years of my Head-mastership, have taught me all that I know about education.

M. L. JACKS.

Mill Hill School.

CHAPTER I

THE CITIZEN IN THE MAKING

CHAPTER I

THE CITIZEN IN THE MAKING

IF it is true that education is a function of society, it is no less true that society is a function of education. Just as society determines the content and the method of its educational practice, and imposes certain limitations, so education determines the form that society is to take, the thoughts that it will think, its attitude and its disposition: and education does that more for the society of to-morrow than for the society of to-day: to-day the life of educational institutions is an enrichment of the life which all enjoy, but it is to-morrow that their deeper influence will be felt and that the society which they have largely created will come into being. We may feel ourselves here to be in a vicious circle, but however we regard the problem we cannot be blind to the fact that it is as a social factor that education is all-important. It is indeed

doubtful whether we can regard education from any other standpoint. The business of education is to prepare our children to live their lives well: but no life can be lived well in isolation, there is no fullness of life except in some form of organized communion with others; and that is what we mean by society on the spiritual side. The inevitable inference is that all our subjects and activities in school and university alike, must have a social bearing, if they are to be educational and not merely instructional: what that bearing is, will be considered in later chapters. Meanwhile, we must be careful not to limit too narrowly the significance of the word "social", nor to bound with too near a horizon the society we would serve. There are some eloquent words of Burke on this matter: the State, he says, "is not a partnership in things subservient only to the gross animal existence of a temporary and perishable nature: it is a partnership in all science; a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between

those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born." Such a conception at once carries us beyond the here and the now, into that wider world of the Great Society of mankind which, whether men live or die, always demands our allegiance and our service. Nor must we stop there. It is not only for citizenship in the United Kingdom of Great Britain (even in Burke's enlarged and enlightened sense) that we would prepare our children, but for citizenship in the United Kingdom of Heaven and Earth: no Act of Union ever made that kingdom one: it has been united from the beginning of time, and from the beginning of time man has been rendering to God the things that are God's, and to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, yet exercising not two citizenships but one. When he has tried to make them two, he has made a sorry business of both, and the less he has thought about the other world, the more hideous he has made this.

Such then is the society for which the boys and girls in our schools are citizens in the making. About the larger conception, there

will be more to be said later: meanwhile, we will begin with a consideration of education and society in the narrower sense. At the outset it is important to emphasize a fundamental truth—that the interest which society takes in boys and girls now at school, and in what is being done for them there, differs widely from that taken by the boys and girls themselves and by their parents. It is this which makes it so difficult to put into a sentence what are the aims of education, and renders all such attempts unsatisfactory: to the parent education aims at one thing, to the child at another, and to the State at a third. The parent contemplates in his child a unique personality, and asks the school for its development to its highest power: it is the whole child who is to be developed—body, mind, and character—and a child, moreover, who is different from all other children. That attitude of the parent forms the subject of a common jest among schoolmasters, but it is in fact no jesting matter: it expresses sober truth, and truth which the schoolmaster must make his own, if he is to do his work as it should be done. Fichte's definition of the ends of education—

" To educate a man means to give him opportunity to make himself complete master and ruler of his whole power "—a partial definition like most of the others—expresses admirably the parents' point of view.

What of the child? So far as he considers the question at all (and many consider it very little), his school life is for him a vocational training: he objects to those subjects which in his own words " are not going to be any use to me afterwards "; to earn a living is the end in view, and a living means a living for the body, even if the soul is starved; that there is a living to be earned for both body and soul is a fact which commonly does not fall very much within his purview, at any rate in the earlier stages of his education. He studies his subjects—even those which he may regard as in the end valueless—not for themselves, not for the truth and culture they may bring to him, but for the contribution they may make to success in an examination, without which he will not be able to earn his living; and they are to be abandoned as soon as that end is achieved. Meanwhile, his leisure is commonly filled for him—in many schools (and this seems to be a

fault of the public school system in particular) too adequately filled—and the problem of what to do with leisure time is no problem at all. But he has to learn, his parents have to learn, and it is the business of the schoolmaster to teach them, that this is going to be, with the increasing mechanization of life, a problem of increasing importance, not only for the individual, but for society also ; society may be made or marred by its leisure occupations. It is not only that there will be more leisure, but that many occupations are likely to become so mechanical that even during the operation of them the mind will be left free to pursue its own course ; and a mind barren of all interests other than the utilitarian, so easily and so mechanically satisfied, will mean a life scarcely tolerable. Meanwhile, however, it is the utilitarian interest that is predominant, and this, it must be added, forms part, but only part, of the parents' ambitions also in the matter of education.

Society, however, cares for none of these things as ends in themselves : it cares for them only as means to a greater end—the service

of the State. The process of education is an apprenticeship for citizenship, and the more the school can be a miniature reproduction of the larger community outside, the more practice in actual citizenship it can provide, the more its subjects can have of a social value, and the particular social value that the particular form of State requires; the more these things are done, the better. It is true, of course, that citizenship, like most other things, can best be learned by actual practice, and a school community is well adapted for reproducing, under protected conditions, many of the circumstances which determine adult citizenship. This is particularly so with boarding schools, and gives such schools a certain advantage over others: and it is significant of the importance attached (not only by the State) to this function of the school, that many of the characteristics of boarding-school life are being adopted by day schools: there is the Prefect system, the organization of extra-curricular activities, the division into Houses, and so forth: and these things are adopted because they occasion just those responsibilities for the welfare of others as well

as for oneself, that concern for the proper administration of one's own time, that conflict of loyalties, which meet every citizen every day of his life. The school becomes in this way "A little world, the image of the great." The State, however, may not be content with that. It may demand from the school an acceptance of the particular form of polity which it embodies, and an education for that: a socialistic government may insist that text-books should be re-written in the interests of socialism, or an internationally-minded government in the interests of internationalism. When that happens, it is the duty of the school to resist, to assert its independence, to bid defiance to all "isms", and to stress the wider conception of citizenship which by its life and teaching it conveys. To the State, as to the parent, it is, of course, important that the child's own end should be achieved, and that ultimately he should earn his own living: but this is a matter of secondary importance, and it has mainly a negative value—the value of not adding to the burden of public assistance: the bare earning of a living may be no part of constructive citizenship. It may indeed be

exactly the reverse : a boy who leaves school trained to earn his living as a jerry-builder, will be educated from his own point of view, but in doing more harm than good to the society of which he forms a part, extremely ill-educated from its point of view. In the same way, the highly developed individualist, the dry-as-dust student in his study, may be highly educated in his parents' sense, and may indeed pass to the world at large as a highly educated man, but to the State his education has been no education at all, unless or until he puts his learning at the service of his fellows. Nor can the parent or the child be expected to look upon the matter as society does : we have all heard the father's complaint of the son who has thrown away all the advantages of an expensive education, to devote himself in humble and unrecognized paths to the service of his fellows : but he is the educated man whom society needs. "A complete and generous education", said Milton, "is that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war" : such humble service of our fellows is one of the public

offices of peace, and the voice of Milton is the voice of society.

In obedience to that voice the State has shouldered more and more of the burden of education. It is a far cry now to the early thirties of the nineteenth century, and the first meagre grant of £20,000 per annum voted by Parliament "for the education of the poor": and it is significant of the State's attitude at that time that it was the poor who were the object of this benevolence, and that the administration of the grant was left to two voluntary societies, the British and Foreign School Society and the National Society. Up till 1833 the work of education had been carried on by such voluntary bodies, though it is interesting to remember that as early as 1802 the law imposed an obligation on employers to provide some instruction for the children employed in their factories. That was the first time in this country that the State showed any interest in the education of the people, and it was clearly a humanitarian interest, and not a political. The story of the past hundred years in education has often been told: it is a story of increasing local and

national expenditure from £20,000 in 1834 to £82,000,000 in 1935, of a series of Acts of Parliament gradually extending State responsibility and State control, from 1870, when the education of the whole populace was first contemplated, to the half-hearted attempt to raise the school age of 1936. It is really the story, a simple one in outline though complicated in detail, of the growth of the State as *parent*: the State has never among us assumed the role of schoolmaster in the narrow sense: it has been concerned not with the mental training of future scholars, but with the general well-being of future citizens. That, of course, is not universally true of all times and countries. Plato, in the *Republic*, made the State very much the schoolmaster of the people: it was to prescribe their curriculum—it was, for instance, to banish the poets as dangerous teachers of dangerous doctrine. To-day we have not to cast our eyes very far afield to see the same process in operation: Russia, Germany, and Italy all derive no inconsiderable portion of their strength from the fact that Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini are the schoolmasters of their people. But though

there have been threatenings of that from time to time among us (entirely in the sphere of local authorities and usually silenced at birth), it has never been our way. The State has been parent but not schoolmaster: it has concerned itself with food and clothing and healthy conditions of life, made itself responsible for medical and dental treatment, insisted on adequate instruction being given in subjects which every *child* (not every citizen in embryo) should know: this is paternalism, for these are the matters which are the natural responsibility of every father of a family; it is not political propaganda. The schools are to train citizens—yes: but the good citizen is the good *man*, the training is to be general, and the mind of the future citizen is not to be warped, or to be bent in this particular direction, or in that. Much has been gained in the process, but the usurpation of a parent's functions has inevitably, as we shall see in the next chapter, entailed some loss. Meanwhile, it will be interesting to consider what has been the dominating motive in this development.

We have seen that the first step was determined by humanitarian considerations. But

that was in 1802, and already in 1776 Adam Smith had written in *The Wealth of Nations* these words: "The State derives no inconsiderable advantage from the instruction of the people. An instructed and intelligent people are always more decent and orderly than a stupid one. In those countries where the safety of government depends very much upon the favourable judgment which the people may form of its conduct, it must surely be of the highest importance that they should not be disposed to judge rashly or capriciously concerning it." Premonitory mutterings of "We must educate our masters." And though humanitarianism seems often to be in the forefront, we may assume that politics were not far behind. Political considerations have indeed played a role of increasing importance in determining the direction and the pace of educational advance—not in the interests of any one party, but in the interests of the body politic as a whole: for it has become increasingly clear that an uneducated democracy is a contradiction in terms. Democracy, under such conditions, deteriorates into some other form of government. Democracy

demands for its success a high degree of education in the people, and where it has failed, it has failed in part through lack of that. Autocracy demands no such education, indeed is better without it. In this country, perhaps more by good fortune than by good management, we have preserved a democratic system: and an influential contributory factor to that preservation has been the series of Education Acts which have found their way to the Statute book since the Reform Bills of last century. Extensions of the franchise are bound to be followed, if they are not to be a danger to the State, by extensions of educational opportunity. Since the extensions of the franchise which came as a result of the war, there has been marked educational advance, and the attempt to-day to raise the school age to fifteen is in part a consequence of what was done then. There is no political party in the State to-day that would cut down educational facilities: parties of the advanced Left might redistribute them, but the redistribution would be aimed at making the best available for a greater number of people or for those best able to benefit by it. We must, then

recognize fully the part that has been played by politics in this matter. Despite that, however, humanitarianism has played a greater part. It is indeed significant that the great bulk of the public money voted for education has gone to the education of the poor, and that only of recent years have grants been made to the older universities, where the middle and upper classes are educated : that in itself, owing to the development of Secondary Education since 1902, which was prompted by these humanitarian considerations and which has resulted in a much larger flow of students to these universities from *all* social classes, may be regarded as in part a result of the same humanitarianism. It is significant too, that the standard of comfort and material well-being, as measured by up-to-date buildings and equipment, is considerably higher in a school built out of public money for the children of the less well-to-do, than in a public school in the technical sense. It may indeed be questioned whether the provision is not too complete. It is men, not buildings, that make a city : but when the buildings are on too lavish a scale, the men may be forgotten, and

their very manhood may become a weak, unambitious, and dependent thing. When I see a new county school, with its class-rooms so arranged that every pupil is always working in a sunlit room, fitted with Vita-glass in the windows, with loggias and verandahs to be used in fine weather, with a kitchen and a department of domestic economy equipped with electric stoves and all the latest labour-saving appliances, with a cinema and large and elaborate stage in the great hall, with rooms set apart for every conceivable activity and fitted up with all the most up-to-date apparatus, surrounded by playing-fields with their ready-made pitches—when I see all this ready-made, I wonder if the children brought up in such a place will ever be able to make anything for themselves (and to make something by yourself is one of the ends of education): I wonder too what must be their feelings when they go home, how the girls will manage a much less well-equipped house, and what is the sense of values that they take away from such an environment. However that may be, these are the standards that are observed in schools built out of public money, and a

Poor Law School has often been better provided than a private school: these facts are really significant of a religious and humanitarian interest on the part of the Public Authority, for the poor will not make better citizens than the well-to-do, nor do the well-to-do need less education in citizenship than the poor, nor can it safely be assumed that they necessarily acquire it in the schools for which they pay. But despite this illogicality, the State has been making citizens (particularly since 1870), just as the factory, the school, the university, and the workshop have been making technicians, scholars, doctors, lawyers, and craftsmen.

What, then, does the State mean by a citizen? The answer to that question varies, of course, with the character of the State. The authoritarian State will educate for subservience, the democratic for freedom: the authoritarian State will demand citizens who will be cogs in a wheel, the democratic citizens who will be dynamic forces to mould a new and better order: the authoritarian State will put a premium on obedience, the democratic on enterprise. In an authoritarian

State free thought will be discouraged, and a man who thinks for himself is a danger to the body politic: "Truly," said Thomas Carlyle, "a Thinking Man is the worst enemy the Prince of Darkness can have"—a significant comment that, on the totalitarian State to-day! Nor is the man who *lives* for himself to be more easily tolerated than one who *thinks* for himself: a sublime disregard is shown for the individual, he is of no value as such, and swift and cruel is the retribution that falls upon any assertion of his individuality: all human values are sacrificed to political values: how far removed is this from the humanitarian principles which have partially directed educational history in this country! a dictatorship knows no humanitarian principles. Finally, the authoritarian State will use every instrument at its command for the inculcation of political views: the State is not only the parent, but also the schoolmaster: it enters into the class-room, the lecture hall, the journalist's office, the church, the cinema, the broadcasting station, and from one and all of these teaches a definite and clear-cut political faith, summed up in the apotheosis of itself.

The following description of Nazi methods of education, taken from articles in the *New Statesman* written by an Englishman who taught for three years in a German school, is illustrative of the authoritarian State's attitude to the school :

" Nazi officials are sent into schools, walk into the classes and cross-examine the teacher before his pupils, and if they think necessary, arrest him at once. Attempts are made to find out from children what their parents' politics are. . . . Religious lessons consist for the most part of talks about Herr Hitler and the glories of Germany. . . . Hitler is the second Jesus, but greater than the first, because he had not only one Power but the whole world against him. The State is everything, the individual nothing, and to this end every subject of instruction must be turned. Art must work people up to patriotic passion. Literature is to be purely patriotic, and books which treat of peace and international understanding are not allowed even in private hands. The young are to be taught history in such a way that they shall above all things reverence the German army and see in it the

emblem of Germany's highest achievement. Every week the children have a patriotic lesson, devoted to the Treaty of Versailles, the crimes of the Allies, the Jews, and the Communists, and to the great Germans, who are not Goethe, Bach, Kant, but Barbarossa, Frederick the Great, Bismarck. Nationalism is a religion in the class-rooms. The teacher asks leading questions, such as 'Who, at the present day, reminds us most strongly of Jesus by his love of the people and his self-sacrifice?' to which the answer is 'Herr Hitler,' and 'Who remind us by their devotion and loyalty of the Disciples?'—'General Goering, Dr Goebbels, and Hauptmann Roehm.' The school morning prayer runs 'Lord, we German children tread before Thy countenance, beseeching Thee to make us as our fathers were. Give us already in our early years a pious mind and strong hands. Protect our Fatherland, this most glorious on earth. Let it be free and united, let it flourish proud and strong. And do Thou protect with Thy strong hands the great and bold Chancellor and the President of the Reich. Bless our leaders. Amen.'" That is called education in Germany to-day,

and there is the totalitarian State as Schoolmaster.

Very different will be the democratic objective and the democratic method. The free use of the human reason is the very bedrock of existence: it is fundamental that the individual should be able to be himself and think for himself, for only so can he be of value to the community to which he belongs. Persuasion and discussion take the place of cruelty and violence. No political faith is taught in the class-room, preached from the pulpit, or broadcast over the air: and it is the apotheosis, not of the State, but of the ultimate values of truth, goodness, and beauty that is the objective. The achievement of these objectives—the production of a thinking man, able to grapple with the complexities of life in a free society, and to express an intelligent opinion, which will be worth having, on the problems which confront such a society—can only be the result of a long and a lengthening educational process, as the complexities increase. It cannot be completed in the first fourteen or even fifteen years of a child's life, and it will provide him with more

"beneficial employment"—beneficial not only to himself, but also to the society to which he belongs—than any that can be found outside the school, till he is of mature years.

It is, then, into such a framework that we must fit the citizen whom we in England would make. But it is a changing framework. The picture we would paint is kaleidoscopic, and therein lies the main difficulty of the artist. It is a commonplace of conversation that we live in an age of transition: but this remark, first made (it is reported) by Adam to Eve as they left the Garden of Eden, has been understood always, as it was then, of transition from one fixed state to another: there have been many such ages of transition in the history of mankind. But the present age of transition is different from all that have gone before: for it is the transition from one transition to another. The acceleration of that which is perhaps euphemistically described as human progress is such that we may doubt whether mankind will ever again live in a fixed condition, unless it be the fixed condition of primitive life to which the "civilization" of a society based on

war may yet reduce us. But we cannot make provision for such a future. We must make provision, we must educate our citizens, for an age which will be changing all the time, and changing at an ever-increasing pace. The best citizen will be the man who can best meet the demands of change. This involves not only certain physical demands, which schools are in a position to supply but for the most part signally fail to supply to-day, but more important than these an extreme flexibility of mind, not easy to achieve in an age in which ideas as well as motor-cars are mass-produced. In the things of the mind, the Press, the Broadcasting Station, and the Advertiser's Hoarding may be compared to the Ford factory in the more material sphere. We live in an age in which the opinion of to-day may become the prejudice of to-morrow, and there is no one more slow to detect a prejudice than the victim of it. The best protection against that particular danger is a Socratic outlook on life. "In his own breast," says Matthew Arnold, "does not every man carry about with him a possible Socrates in that power of a disinterested play of consciousness

upon his stock notions and habits?" It is that possible Socrates that it must be the aim of education to bring to life, so that we may send out from our schools men and women who will not fall ready victims to press slogans, advertisers' lies, and broadcast ideas, but who will be intelligent questioners of all they meet—intelligent questioners not only of their own "stock notions and habits", but also of the stock notions and habits of others, and of those new notions to which every day will give birth and those new habits which every day will threaten to establish. These must all be brought to the bar of judgment: there will be a great host of them crowding into the court, and the judgment must be ready to receive them and capable of passing the right verdict on them. It is our business to train that judgment at school, for only so shall we train citizens and not automata for to-morrow, for the world that is to be, and not for the world that is or was. It is important that we teachers should realize the necessity for that forward-looking attitude, that duty which is ours to try to anticipate Time, for it will have far-reaching repercussions on our

teaching-practice in schools and universities. There is a danger that we should neglect it: there is a danger that we should educate for the world as we know it, or (worse still) for the world as we knew it when we were boys and girls ourselves. I don't think that danger is appreciated: I don't think it is realized, and least of all by ourselves, how easily we tend to re-create in our schools the world in which we have ourselves grown up, how much of our teaching is directed to to-day or yesterday: it must be directed to to-morrow—a task of infinite difficulty and complexity. "I believe in the boys and girls of to-day," is the schoolmaster's real creed, "the fathers and mothers of a great to-morrow."

In the creation of that to-morrow, whose birth-throes are the labours of education, home, Church, and school—the three chief educational instruments of our time—are invited to co-operate: for it is through these three, without dictating to them, that society must work, and no wise parent, no pastor with a sense of responsibility, no schoolmaster who deserves to hold his position, can be blind to the social importance of what he has

undertaken. It follows that in the work of education the diverse and partial aims with which the child, the parent, and society start, have somehow to be reconciled and to be fused into one. The child's desire to earn a living, the parent's desire for the development of a unique individual, and the State's desire to welcome a citizen—these three, at first seemingly incompatible, must be unified. Nor is the task impossible. The solution to the problem is to be found in the conception of the best individual as the best citizen : of the man whose capacities are not only developed to their highest power, but also directed to the end which he as a social being most truly desires, as the one who is likely to make the most valuable, and indeed a unique, contribution to the community. The solution is, indeed, as old as Aristotle. Man is a social and political animal, not in the sense that he herds with his kind (for that is a characteristic of many animals, and is no distinguishing mark), but in the sense that only in some form of social organization does he find his full self-realization. " In every sense ", said Carlyle, " one is but an unhealthy fraction when

alone ; only in society with his equals a whole." The individualist who, in pursuit of his individualism, cuts himself off from his fellows, the hermit in his cell, St Simeon on his pillar, is making a fundamental mistake and achieves the reverse of what he desires. Society is no outcome of a social contract : it is the outcome of man's determination to express himself and to make the most of himself. It is not only the *development* of capacity that matters, but also its *direction*, and in the light of the direction, the development becomes not a selfish but a social proceeding. There is great truth in the observation that the highest form of social service is often not that doing of somebody else's business which is so popular (and commonly so beneficent), but the making of oneself a better man : if that comes first, everything else will be added unto it. "Reform one man—reform thy own inner man : it is more than scheming out reforms for a nation"—I quote Carlyle again. The clearest image is the image of the jigsaw puzzle. The finished picture is unknown, the kaleidoscope picture of the future : all that is known is that each piece is essential,

however angular and awkward, that without its angularity and awkwardness, indeed, it will not fit into the puzzle or make its contribution to the whole: there is a splash of needed colour here, the tracing of the pattern there, and alter either of these pieces, try to intensify or subdue the colour, or to improve the waywardness of a line, and the picture is spoilt: each piece must be itself and no other if it is to play its part in the whole. I believe that to be a true illustration of the relationship subsisting between individuals in any society, and between nations in any organized society of mankind. It may be called the contributory theory: respect for human personality is based on the needs of society, and patriotism is devotion to a country for what it can *give* and not for what it can *get*. It is possible to review the history of mankind and see how each great people has been remarkable for some particular gift, specialists, by the grace of God, in some one aspect of the art of living. There were the Hebrews of old, with a peculiar genius for religion, who in the perception of spiritual truth were centuries ahead of the Greeks; they, in their turn, specialists in the art of

thought and in the creation of beauty, were thinking far more profoundly than their contemporaries in Palestine and of the Dispersion, and were making additions to man's understanding of the universe and to the loveliness of life which these latter never equalled. There were the Romans, with their unique gift for law. So on through the centuries. We may see these national contributions to the society of mankind, as we can see the individual contributions to any smaller society. Any educational system founded on this theory is, of course, founded on a venture of faith—faith in the uniqueness of the individual soul, and ultimately in a peculiar national genius which the world needs. But when once that venture of faith has been made—and without it or a similar venture all education is impossible—the way becomes clear. The schoolmaster finds himself at one with the parent—the child's end is comprehended in the larger end—and all three are consciously or unconsciously dominated by the idea of the whole. The citizen is being made.

There remains one outstanding problem. Schools are the happy hunting grounds of all

kinds of societies and movements for this, that, or the other purpose: hardly a day passes without a request arriving by post for the admission of a lecturer in some good cause, or for a collection to be made for some particular association: we are the advertisers' and the propagandists' paradise. To all these approaches we may turn a deaf ear, but what is to be our attitude towards the demands of the State? To what extent are we to take our orders from the government of the day? When and where are we to assert our independence? This is a problem which faces other institutions beside schools: it faces the Churches, and particularly the Established Church, and we may see the dangers involved in too close a dependence on the State when we consider the sorry record of such a Church, bound to be false to its fundamental Christian ideals, in time of war. May not schools in a similar position find themselves false to their fundamental ideal, which is to teach truth? May not the making of a citizen, if unduly emphasized, mean the unmaking of a true man? We must distinguish in this connection between two types of schools—those

depending on financial assistance out of public funds, and those entirely independent of such assistance—and it is doubtful whether it is possible to legislate in black and white for either. The limitations of the first are, however, more clearly laid down than of the second, and those who control them are bound to recognize that they can only be their own masters within the definite field of public approval as represented in the government of the day: but that government, if it is wise, will recognize the value of independence in schools, and will make the field as wide as possible, leaving plenty of scope for experiment. Educational advance is bound to be the result of bold experiment, and that puts a very special responsibility on schools of the second class—the independent schools. They are entirely unfettered to try what they will—in methods of organization, in curriculum, in staffing and conditions of service, in the interests they propagate, in new forms of school government: and it is to them that the State must look for new educational principles proved sound by a process of trial and error, and tested in the fire of experience, for adoption on a larger

scale. An independent school is false to its trust unless it fulfils this privilege of independence. Meanwhile wisdom alone, and no legal enactment, will lay upon it the limitations it must observe as a training-ground for citizens, and prescribe its relations to the government: to take a concrete instance, such schools are free to maintain or not, as they will, a contingent of the Officers' Training Corps: whatever might be my views on military training, I should consider it a strong argument for the maintaining of such a contingent (on a voluntary basis) if the government held that the Corps was necessary to the national safety, and a strong argument for disbanding it if a changed government held the opposite view. It is on such lines that I would solve this problem of loyalty and independence, subject only to the condition that the demands of the State should never involve anything unworthy or untrue. I am reminded of the words of Vittorino, when accepting a post as tutor in the family of an Italian nobleman: "I accept the post, on this understanding only, that you require from me nothing that shall be in any way unworthy

of either of us ; and I will continue to serve you, so long as your life shall command respect." The truth is that just as the individual can only find full self-realization in some society, so a school can only perform its function fully and be a school in the truest sense when it fits into the pattern of the national life.

It is in such a school that the citizen will be made ; but the process must begin in the home, and to the home we turn our attention in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II

THE WORK OF EDUCATION: THE HOME

CHAPTER II

THE WORK OF EDUCATION: THE HOME

IN the last chapter it was maintained that education as a social factor means the making of a citizen in a comprehensive sense, and that in that process the three chief educational instruments of our time—the home, the school, and the Church—must co-operate. Inevitably, and increasingly under the pressure of contemporary social and economic conditions, the school finds itself forced into being the chief of these three: but priority in time, and therefore priority of treatment, belongs to the home. What is the part to be played by the home in this creative task? And with what success, or with what failure does it meet to-day?

It has been pointed out that a parent's chief interest in the making of a citizen lies in the development to its highest power of a unique personality, destined to make a unique contribution in due course to the welfare of

society. That unique personality is commonly thought of as comprehending body, mind, and spirit—a tripartite division with which we are familiar and which we may accept for the sake of convenience. For the sake of convenience only, however: for that division, or a division on any similar lines, is fallacious and may be dangerous. We must not divide, if we would be good educators, the seamless coat of personality: a disembodied mind is as meaningless an abstraction as a despiritualized body: no one member of the trinity can in fact be conceived, or can live any life worth living, or can find any effective expression, except in conjunction with the other two. It would be platitudinous to point out, if it were not so frequently forgotten, that we can bring to the light of day and to the service or disservice of mankind whatever is in us, and that it is through some bodily organ that the inward and spiritual grace must be manifested. The brain, says Shakespeare, is "apprehensive, quick, forgetive, full of nimble, fiery, and delectable shapes: which, delivered o'er to the voice, the tongue, which is the birth, become excellent wit": but they

become excellent nothing, until they are thus delivered over to the body; nor are our strivings after beauty, which are the work of the spirit, of any relevance or any significance until the skill of the hand has translated them into "storied urn" or "animated bust". And the body itself were a poor and senseless thing without the mind to keep it erect and to give it something to express, and the will to drive it in the way it should take. These three are indeed inseparable, we must educate all three together, and we must not neglect any one. In education we have for the most part lost sight of this truth, and our prevailing practice in schools and colleges does much to obscure it: it is our habit to keep these three in watertight compartments, to educate the mind in the class-room or lecture hall, the body (if this may be called education, which I doubt) on the playing-field, and the spirit in religious exercises and when and where we may. The result is that we know exceedingly little of the interaction of the three on one another, and that we commonly fail to educate a complete human being. We have the brain-less athlete, the soul-less financier, and the

saint with no backbone. There is a wide field for research here, but the research work is only just beginning. It is, however, beginning, and experiments have been made in certain schools, and illuminating facts have been discovered. It has been discovered, to take a solitary and perhaps mundane instance, that whereas near the age of sixteen a boy ought to be putting on about two pounds in weight every term, such boys, in the term in which they sit for the School Certificate examination, tend either to lose weight or at best to stand still. It has been discovered too that, whereas under the old military system of physical training a boy would return to his classes from such a period fatigued and listless, under the new and more enlightened syllabus which is being gradually adopted he comes back with an increase in mental alertness and a stimulated activity: so much so that many schools are finding that the old plea of there being no time for physical training under the pressure of examination subjects, has no validity, and that what is lost on the swings is more than made up on the roundabouts. An exceedingly interesting experiment was recently

carried out in certain Liverpool schools: School Certificate forms of approximately equal attainments and mental calibre, were taken, and to one group was given the bare minimum of physical training demanded by the regulations, to the other a daily period: when at the end of the year the examination results of the two groups were compared, the second beat the first hands down. That is an isolated experiment, and many more are needed. But we are beginning to find out important truths in this matter, though there is much still to be done.

The important point, however, is that the old departmentalism must be avoided, and the home is the sphere in which that can best be done. There are no class-rooms and no playing-fields at home, commonly no division between work and play, and the moral and spiritual values grow naturally out of the family life which is the creation of all. Apart, therefore, from the fact that it is in its earliest years that a child is most sensitive and most educable (a fact borne out by the experience of us all, and epitomized in the saying attributed to Cardinal Newman, "Give me a child till he is seven, and

you can do what you like with him afterwards"), this at once gives the home an enormous advantage over every other place of education, and is a principal reason why *ideally* the home is the best school. Evidence for the truth of this observation could be forthcoming from many sources, some of it negative evidence but not the less convincing: every teacher, for instance, has experienced the difficulty of dealing with a child from what we call a "bad home", by which we mean no real home at all: we know too, how often good work done in school is undone under the family roof, and how holidays sometimes stultify terms: and it is interesting to read that out of 459 juvenile offenders arrested in a big city during one week, 69 per cent. came from homes (if the word may be used) where the rent was less than 7s. 6d. a week. None of these children, the problems of the schoolmaster or magistrate, have received those rudiments of education which only a home can give, and often gives unconsciously: and the result is that they are warped in some part of their personality, over-developed here or under-developed there, lop-sided human beings,

misfits, pieces of the jigsaw puzzle whose colours have been washed out and whose angles have been cruelly broken.

If, then, the home is the ideal educational instrument, how does it go to work, how does it affect body, mind, and spirit?—separating them for convenience, but remembering that they are never treated in isolation. The education of the body (to take that first) is not only seeing that it is supplied with the proper food and the proper surroundings for physical well-being—though that duty of parenthood is, of course, included in the matter. It is an elementary duty, but it is often neglected. Ignorance is often the cause of the neglect—ignorance of the constitution of foodstuffs and the demands of the growing frame, ignorance which with increasing frequency is being concentrated in a *tin* of meat or a *bottle* of fruit: truly the convenience of tinned foods has much to answer for. Thoughtlessness is also the cause of the neglect: there are far too many houses where a boy or girl has to do homework to the accompaniment of the wireless, with the result that most boys scamp it and most girls pursue it to an impossibly late hour: where

the father's evening visit to the cinema becomes a family outing, and where the hours of sleep are in consequence cut down far beyond what is needed. Under such circumstances, no body can be educated, though it may be kept alive. But the education of the body means much more than this. It means also the discovery and the eliciting of that hidden skill which is our birth-right, before the mechanization of life reduces our children, too, to the dead level of machines : in its earliest years a child is not ashamed (as later), but rather proud of its physical skill—witness the triumphant progress of its first walk—and the joy of achievement and of creation in the physical sphere is felt to the full. A wise parent can discover this native skill, and can direct and perpetuate this joy, till it becomes a joy for ever. The schoolmaster or schoolmistress often comes too late upon the scene. In those early years innate skill finds a free outlet in all kinds of natural self-expression : later on the flow is stopped by convention, by the herd-instinct, by fear of public opinion, by self-consciousness, and the task of removing the stoppage, and letting the waters flow free

again, may be beyond the skill of the most expert teacher. There is, too, the joy of sheer physical movement, as a good thing in itself—that poetry of motion which is so marked in children, and so conspicuously absent in the city clerk or the university professor: before the shades of the prison which is called "self-consciousness" begin to close upon the growing boy, this, too, can be seized and encouraged in dancing and rhythmical movement of every sort: it is likely that a rhythmical life will result, instead of the kind of syncopated jazz which aptly describes the existence of most of us. And a rhythmical life not only as a thing worth cultivating for itself, but also as a source of economy in muscular activity. There are natural rhythms of the body suppressed or unexpressed in most of us, which, if they find their expression in all the everyday movements of life, walking, running, or even in standing still, result in an enormous saving of energy and consequent absence of fatigue. It is probably true to say that we all use up much more energy than we need in such movement, and that the tiredness of which we so often complain could be avoided if our bodies were

educated and those rhythms were released. One sees the effect of such release in much folk-dancing—a spontaneous and entirely natural form of physical expression—in which the instructed dancer can dance the sun down and be as fresh at the end as he was at the beginning. The same truth has been proved in certain social clubs, notably in America, where business men and business women, waitresses in teashops and the like, have discovered through rhythmical exercises that they can do a day's work, on their feet all the time, and suffer no undue fatigue at the end of it. And if that can be done later in life, how much more easily in early days when these rhythms are the visible stuff of daily living, and have not yet been suppressed. With that will go a self-respect, and especially a bodily self-respect, which will be not only a defence against many of the assaults of the evil one, but also a stabilizing force in the welter of experience, and a source of added beauty and satisfaction. There is no boy who does not evince a natural interest in a piece of machinery. Give him an engine, and it will be his perpetual delight to take it to pieces and

put it together again, to discover just how it all works, and to keep it clean and well-oiled. He will not only evince an interest in it, but will regard it with wonder and respect, and will develop a sense of responsibility towards it. There is no reason why that interest should not be transferred to the most intricate and most wonderful bit of machinery he is ever likely to possess—and that is his own body: and with the interest will come the same wonder and respect, the same sense of responsibility. And education is largely the development of a sense of responsibility: the irresponsible are the uneducated. That is the kind of thing that is meant by physical education, and the home is the place for it, because it must be begun *early*: such efforts as we make later in life are largely nullified by early neglect. This is particularly marked in secondary schools, especially when the boys are drawn largely from private schools. Much corrective and remedial work has to be done for boys who are suffering from physical disabilities—such as round shoulders and flat feet and curved spines—which are unnecessary and avoidable by early education. The groundwork for

any scheme of physical training which ought to be covered by the age of fourteen has commonly not been covered, and the superstructure is therefore impossible. When a boy comes who *has* been trained, the difference is noticeable at once: I saw a school play not long ago in which one of the supers, who walked on, walked on with a grace, ease, and dignity which marked him off from all the other characters: he knew what to do with his limbs, and enquiry showed that he had learnt this through a course of eurhythmics at his preparatory school. That preliminary work must be done, and must be begun at home.

Nor will this be only *physical* education. In all this the mind too (as I shall show later on) will be indirectly receiving education, but more direct education may be provided in other ways. A home where there are books in the shelves and pictures on the walls: where the father and mother have intellectual interests and intelligent friends: where there is general conversation at meal-times: where a child is encouraged to have opinions of its own, and given the self-confidence to express

them: where there is nothing of the herd-instinct to repress unusual convictions: where independence of thought is neither over-prized nor under-estimated: where a true sense of values is unobtrusively inculcated: such a home, which is simple and is realizable in most classes of society, can provide a mental training such as is found nowhere else in the world, not under the stimulus of the most skilful school-master, nor in a meeting of the most learned society. Meanwhile, the life of the family itself is educating the character or spirit, with but little conscious direction from above. But first, be it observed, it must be a family, and that means more than one child: the only child is handicapped in many ways, and his education at home often becomes a mis-education: he misses, of course, the natural companionship of his peers, the give-and-take, the self-denial, and the self-expression which such companionship involves: that is obvious: what is less obvious, though no less damaging, is the emotional stress to which he may well be exposed through the emotional stresses of his parents—stresses which are almost bound to come, but the effect of which is

dissipated when there are more than one to feel it: he receives, too, a disproportionate share of his mother's love and care: he commonly becomes an egoist, self-centred and self-absorbed, a dreamer of day-dreams, crying so insistently and so loudly for his own dreams to come true that he is blind to the dreaming and deaf to the crying of others: such an environment is no school for citizenship, which must so work that the good dreams of *all* shall come true, and such an education is a very lop-sided affair. Given a family of brothers and sisters, however, he grows up in a world which is a copy of the great, and is subjected to disciplinary influences and surrounded by human interests which are the stuff of all good life. There are household occupations, those activities of home or garden which (whether we are conscious of them or not) are the background of our day-to-day existence. There are knocks to be taken, and perhaps knightly blows to be given. There may be the family nurse, an education in herself—"whose clothing", as says the Book of Proverbs, "is strength and honour, who openeth her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue is the law of

kindness, who strengtheneth her arms and eateth not the bread of idleness, whose children in years to come rise up and call her blessed." And there is the persistent demand for loyalty—for devotion to a bigger entity than ourselves, whose interests are more worth while than our own: a community-sense inevitably and unconsciously creeps in, and the way is prepared for citizenship of the larger community later on. All the elements of true education are there, and one of the best schools I have ever known was a kindergarten which was nothing more or less than a home writ large: that was no strange world into which the children journeyed; it was rather a world they knew, but infinitely enriched because they were shown its meaning, a world of little things grown big with importance and significance. They did not wholly leave home behind; they rather found a larger home before.[1] And if the home is the right place for such character training, it is no less right for such spiritual training as we call religious. For the God whom we would have our children

[1] See *A Memoir of Caroline Garrison Bishop*, by Emily Last. Headley Brothers, 1936.

know is essentially a God of the home. That is a distinguishing mark of the Christian deity. Other faiths and other philosophies have put forward noble conceptions of God, but never the conception of a loving Father. The philosophers have used their intelligence, and beginning with man and working from that end have arrived at " The Idea of the Good ", " The First Mover ", " The Ruling Principle ", or " The Absolute ". But these are impersonal abstractions, better studied (as indeed they were worked out) in the school or the university or the philosopher's study, than at a mother's knee. But the Christian goes to work the other way round: he works from the unseen to the seen, from God to man. And the God with whom he begins is the God revealed in Jesus Christ, whose nature is best expressed in the homely terms of fatherhood and sonship and love, and whose life was lived in a carpenter's shop and among the homely scenes of men. He is indeed essentially a God of the home, and in the home is the natural soil for the seeds of religious education.

What then are we to say to these things? There is one thing clearly to be said—and

that is, that home is no longer the educational influence that it was, and that these essential lessons of life are no longer learnt there. The decay of family life is, from the educational standpoint if from no other, one of the tragedies of modern times. It is caused partly by conditions for which we are responsible, and which we might alter, partly by economic and social conditions over which we seem to have but little control. There is the stress of poverty and of limited means, the insecurity of livelihood, and the anxiety for to-morrow: there are the homes at a rental of less than 7s. 6d. a week, and where the rental is higher the children are fewer. "Take no thought for the morrow, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink or what ye shall put on": how many of suffering humanity can obey that precept, and not rather take thought how many children they can afford to have? Very few, and the result is that the large family is a thing of the past. That is, incidentally, having its effect on our imperial responsibilities. The Empire was made to a considerable extent by the younger sons of large families. To-day, when there is only one son, though he himself

is willing to go abroad, his parents are not willing to lose him: and the dearth of British recruits for the Indian Civil Service, of which we hear many complaints, is not only due to the conditions of that service. Nor do the conditions of modern business life make it easy to bring up children: a suburban villa is apt to be no home—it is often little but a dormitory: there is no garden at the back, no room for hobbies and creative activity, no scope for childish interests: life revolves round the father, and business hours and business meal-times are not conducive to the proper education of a young body. Nor are these villas built to *last*. Carlyle used to point out that all real worth in man comes of stability, that character grows from roots like a tree. In healthy times the family home was constructed to last for ages; sons to follow their fathers, working at the same business, educated in established methods of thought and action. Modern houses (in the eighties) were to him symbols of the universal appetite for change. They were not houses at all. They were tents of nomads. Everything was a make-shift. How much more truly might he have

said this to-day! The alternative to a suburban villa is often an hotel or a service-flat, efficient and comfortable places it may be, but soul-less and impersonal : sometimes it is literally a motor-car, and not infrequently the family (of three) lives on wheels—and the domestic virtues are not easily cultivated on wheels. But the car has more to answer for than that : it has introduced a restlessness into our existence, still further jeopardizing that stability which is essential to any kind of home life : home is no longer a place to live in, but a place to go from or to go to, a convenient starting point or returning point for the life of perpetual motion which we live, but not an abiding place. The car, moreover, by increasing our range, has brought within our reach a number of ready-made amusements which take the place of the old family occupations and the self-made amusements which were so educative : there is golf on Sunday instead of church (the boy driving his father to the links and beating him there—good for neither of them), and a run into the country, accompanied by a gramophone, instead of the building of a boat or the flying

of a kite in a back garden. Nor do we even have to use the car to reach many of these ready-made amusements : there is the wireless in the sitting room, turning us into hearers of the word and not doers, and the cinema round the corner, turning us into spectators and not makers : but, as Bacon remarked, "In this universe God only and the angels may be spectators," and the world of to-day does not seem to be peopled by angels ! All these tendencies, social and economic, educational though some of them may be (and the educational influence of the B.B.C. cannot be praised too highly), militate against that home life which is a better education than them all put together. There are other tendencies which work together to the same end. It may be hard, but it is not untrue, to suggest that many parents are themselves imperfectly educated : and a household where the illustrated magazine is the sole reading matter, the wireless the sole recreation, and small talk about one's neighbours the sole topic of conversation, is no school for life. It often means spoilt children, and it is in my experience an interesting social phenomenon,

how much more spoilt are the children of the poor than the children of the well-to-do. And often in such a household there is a strange lack of understanding of the young by the old, and a certain devil-may-care insensibility to the great things that are afoot and to all that they entail : one finds often a father who clings unthinkingly to the old ways, and can have no good word to say of the brave new world into which their mother has born his children : on the other hand there is the man who is most modern of the moderns, but who amid all the modernities is as lost as his children themselves. "The parents themselves have lost their way, and find themselves in no position to help their children" :[1] the wave of materialism has caught them up and is carrying them they know not whither, for they have no deeper springs in the spiritual profundities of life. All this has its inevitable effect upon the home. There is no anchor for the soul there, either in the stability of existence, or in the pattern of goodness, or in the understanding and the sympathetic

[1] *Fathers and Sons*, by E. B. Castle. University of London Press.

interpretation of experience, or in the authority of the simple virtues, or in the answers to the baffling questions of youth: and rudderless the craft puts out to sea. It is a sea full of dangerous currents, and hidden rocks: there are islands of the blest, and islands of the damned: and on their shores there is abundance of gold and dross, of silver and tinsel. "The modern youth", it has been said, "is presented with a bewildering array of possibilities, but has little guidance in choosing between them. In the end he usually tries to sample them all, but there are so many that he has no time to work out a verdict on any one of them before he must move on to the next."[1] His home has been for him no school.

What, then, are the results of this decay of family life? The prime result, which also in the vicious circle may be a cause, is the abdication of the parent. It is clear that what is not done at home, must be done more imperfectly elsewhere, and particularly at school: but that transference of responsibility from home to school is assisted by the

[1] Op. cit.

voluntary acquiescence and indeed encouragement of the parent. There is plenty of excuse for this, not only in the social and economic conditions to which I have drawn attention, but also in the progressive assumption by the State of a parent's responsibilities: we saw in the last chapter how rapid has been the growth of the State as parent. Even more rapid has been the growth of the school in that capacity. The schoolmaster used to be regarded as *in loco parentis*: he is now almost *parens* himself. School is no longer a place where a lesson is to be learnt, as in the grammar schools of the sixteenth century, but where a life is to be lived: it is not the grammar of the Latin tongue that is taught, but the grammar of life itself—and there is little that is not included under that term. At school a boy's whole existence is provided, organized, and planned for him: his work and recreation are supplied, his health is looked after, he receives free medical and dental treatment, free milk, free meals, and sometimes free clothes. It may be questioned whether under such circumstances he appreciates the value of these things, and whether by being compelled

to provide them the school is not being forced into very *uneducational* activities. Educational activities are those that lead to a creative life of self-help and community service, uneducational those that lead to an uncreative life of easy acceptance of the services of others. When a boy sees the necessities of life being won at home by the sweat of a man's brow, and at the cost of sacrifices all round, he learns the lesson that life is "no fool's or sluggard's paradise into which he has wandered by chance, but a battlefield ordained from of old, where there are no spectators, but the youngest must take his side, and the stakes are life and death." These words come from *Tom Brown's School Days*, and describe the lesson that was learnt at Rugby in those hard days. It is doubtful if such a lesson would be learnt in many schools to-day, though still it is more likely to be learnt in the more Spartan public schools than in the provided schools where everything is provided on so lavish a scale. Rather a boy may be taught that those good things are his by right, that they are not to be won but to be ungratefully accepted : and if he is taught that, he will as a man be that pernicious type

place the boy who knows no home will, as a man, create no home : that which used to be a castle will come to be regarded as " somewhere to sleep next door to the garage ",[1] and one of the foundations of our national welfare will increasingly cease to be. And the second effect lies in those words " one of the foundations of our national welfare " : for " the family is the achievement in little of all that human society seeks to be . . . It only comes to its true fulfilment as a creative and redemptive force in the social order of which it forms part . . . and it is the school of civic virtues."[2] If we cannot re-create the home, the civic virtues must be taught, as best they may, somewhere else.

[1] *The Relevance of Christianity*, by F. R. Barry. Nisbet.
[2] Op. cit.

CHAPTER III

THE WORK OF EDUCATION: THE CHURCH

CHAPTER III

THE WORK OF EDUCATION: THE CHURCH

WE saw in the last chapter that the family is the natural school of early childhood. It also enjoys an historical priority in the work of education. Animals and birds learn their way about life from their parents, mainly, it would seem, through imitation: we have probably all witnessed the fascinating spectacle of a swallow giving its young their first lessons in flight. There is no doubt that the young of the human species learn much of the art of living in the same way—how much, we can never say: for our essentially imitative actions often pass unnoticed by ourselves, and it is always difficult to distinguish, even when we are conscious of them, between those which are solely imitative and those which are in any degree original or based on some process of reason. But we emerge from the

region of instinctive imitation when we consider man as a "tool-using animal"—according to Thomas Carlyle one of his distinctive characteristics. For the use of a tool is not learnt by imitation: it has to be taught, and as the tools increase in complexity, so the teaching increases in extent. We may picture our primitive ancestors far back in the dim abysm of time giving such instruction to their sons and daughters: and if those sons and daughters served a kind of apprenticeship for life through imitation, as soon as their father began to explain their first tool to them and show them how it worked, they became the first pupils in a technical school: technical education had in fact begun.

But this exclusive family stage could not last very long, even though right up to to-day the soundness of the body politic still depends on the family's proper discharge of its educational functions. It has been interesting to notice how in Russia the attempt to eliminate the family has failed, and how the official policy of State rearing of children has had to go back to one of family life as necessary to the development of the community. Families

group themselves into larger wholes, they become tribes, and tribes become nations. And with each enlargement, there is an enlargement not only of human needs, but also of human ideals: those ideals and passions, the ideals and passions which make of family groups a People and a Race, become traditional and are jealously guarded by a secret and a sacred caste: and inasmuch as the well-being of the People is bound up with the conservation of the traditions, these become one of the tools to be used for the preservation of life, and as such the use of them has to be taught. Thus it comes about that the priest, in intimate communion with heaven, becomes the controller of the tribal or national polity, and inevitably the schoolmaster of successive generations. The connection between Church and school, which has been one of the formative influences in the history of the human race, which lasted practically unimpaired in this country till a hundred years ago, and of which echoes were heard in the recent Education Bill,—this connection, productive of much good but also a stumbling-block in the way of educational progress, was thus founded. It

meant, of course, that at any rate up to the time of the Renaissance and the Reformation, there was no distinction between secular and religious education, and even to-day the schoolmaster is regarded in certain circles as a kind of lay-adjunct of the clerical profession : it is only of recent years, to take but one example, that the head-mastership of a public school has been given to a layman, and though there are to-day far more lay than clerical headmasters of such schools, still their clerical duties, the sermons they are expected to preach in their chapels and the general cure of souls that they are expected to exercise, are among the most important parts of their work. It may be added in parenthesis that this is all to the good, and that the distinction between secular and religious education, a distinction corresponding to no real difference, is one of the items on the debit side of the educational balance sheet : to reconcile the two in one comprehensive system should be the aim of every teacher. That, however, is by the way. We must return to the Church-directed, not necessarily the God-directed, Middle Ages. Though the Church was the dominant influence, we must not lose

sight of certain educational movements which proceeded outside its sphere. There was the profession of knighthood to which many a page served an apprenticeship in field and castle, a profession which taught a man not only how to fight, but also how to rule those whom he conquered in battle: and out of it there sprang not only men trained to arms, but also men trained in the common law as against the canon law of the Church. Such men taught themselves what it was essential for them to learn, by the one sure method of learning anything, practical apprenticeship to it. "The young Noble", says the author of *Latter Day Pamphlets*, "went apprentice to some elder Noble; entered himself as page with some distinguished earl or duke; and here, serving upwards from step to step, under wise monition, learned his chivalries, his practice of arms and of courtesies, his baronial duties and manners, and what it would beseem him to do and to be in the world—by practical attempt of his own, and example of one whose life was a daily concrete pattern for him." That nobleman's castle was called no school, but it was in fact a most noble school of

experience—the secular arm bringing up its young men. Meanwhile, another secular movement went on in the cities, where merchant and craftsman taught a boy the technique of his trade, and trade guilds formed corporations only less important than the corporations of the Church. "There is a song-smith", says Mr Sharwood Smith, "as well as a blacksmith": the song-smith was the Church, the blacksmith was himself. It is here, it would seem, in these vocational and lay-operated movements, that the idea of secular education as distinct from religious first began, and the truth was not perceived, nor is it perceived to-day, that the making of a perfect horse-shoe, like the making of the yoke for the oxen in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth, is as much a religious act as the making of a song of praise.

However that may be, these lay movements were unimportant compared with the work of the Church, and that work—the work of the priests and clergy who were the only recognized professional teachers—lasted throughout the Middle Ages and survived the Reformation. To some extent it was challenged, even before the Reformation, in

the Universities, where scholar and priest sometimes fell out, but it was unchallenged in the schools: and the old grammar schools, by admitting from the earliest times pupils who were not destined for the Church, and by making themselves responsible for their education, maintained their influence, and the influence of the Church which founded them, after the Reformation had passed. The Protestant pastor succeeded the Catholic priest: there was never any doubt about the teaching zeal of the Puritan divine: many an ejected clergyman after the Act of Uniformity turned schoolmaster, and in many a country rectory to-day boys and girls are coached for examinations: the Charity school, fathered by the Church of the seventeenth century, was followed by the Church schools of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: "a strong initial motive in first providing schools for the poor, before the State recognized it as a public duty, was to enable the individual to read the Bible and on those lines to work out the salvation of his soul"[1]: Sunday Schools covered the face of England: and the first grants

[1] *The Nation at School*, by F. S. Marvin. Clarendon Press.

of public money for education were made to "two societies, the National and the British and Foreign, which had been conducting primary schools and later on were to conduct training colleges for teachers, the former in connection with the national Church, the latter on an undenominational and Biblical basis"[1]: nor is it irrelevant to add that the great majority of the public schools are deliberately founded on a religious basis, and the central position which their chapels hold in their buildings is symbolical of a religious history and a religious purpose, while the place of retirement for their Headmasters has commonly been a Cathedral Close. What will happen to the lay Headmasters of to-day, has yet to be determined!

Truly the Church has dominated our educational history. To-day that position of domination is challenged: but before we consider the nature of that challenge, and its effect upon the teaching function of the Church, we must briefly note one characteristic of its teaching function in the past. The teaching which the Church has given has never been

[1] Op. cit.

wholly disinterested. Doubtless humanitarian motives have often been at work, and the objective aimed at in the village school, to teach the children of the poor to read, write, and to reckon, was in part a disinterested object: doubtless too the work done under the aegis of the Church has been vastly beneficial outside the religious field altogether. But we must remember that it is inside the religious field that the work starts, and that the *particular* religious motive has been always there in the background: whether as part of the Roman Catholic system of authority, or in the national schools of a national society representing the national Church, or in the British and foreign schools based on a particular view of the Bible, or in the Sunday schools founded in the interests of this or that denomination, or in the village schools drowsing under the shadow of the church spire and dreaming not of the good citizen, but of the good churchman, there has always been a definite doctrine to be maintained and a spiritual care to be exercised in a particular direction. The schools have in fact been the recruiting grounds from which soldiers were

to be enlisted for this or that *particular* " army of the Lord ". This does not belittle the value of the work which such schools have done: but it is a fact which has to be borne in mind, and which has, of course, been recognized in the various compromises affecting these so-called " voluntary " schools which have been sanctioned by Act of Parliament, notably in 1902 and in 1936. It is a fact, moreover, which is of diminishing importance to-day. The complaint is often heard that, despite the body of religious instruction given in schools, the churches are in fact empty: and the facile conclusion is drawn that the growing generation is an irreligious generation. That conclusion I believe to be false. There is abundant evidence among young people of a deep and sincere interest in religion: what is vanishing is the interest in denominational religion. And that puts a wholly new complexion on the teaching function of the Church to-day.

It still has a teaching function, and a definite duty to fulfil and a part of paramount importance to play in the educational field. Many of its old duties have been taken over by the State, and some of them no longer answer

the needs of a questioning and highly critical generation. The State has assumed responsibilities for the efficiency of Church schools: its inspectors enter their walls and demand certain standards in accommodation and premises, in physical well-being, and in mental and moral attainment: through its examination system it prescribes the subjects that are to be taught and the level that is to be reached: it enacts that religious instruction is to be given, but the school is left free to determine the precise nature of the religious instruction, in accordance with its origin and history, and enjoys a partial freedom in the appointment of its teachers: the price of that freedom is the obligation to preserve the fabric of the school in the condition that is demanded—a price which many voluntary schools find it increasingly hard to pay. Meanwhile, the boys and girls and their parents are showing a less lively interest in the particular tenets of this or that religious body: the very tenacity with which these are often maintained, with the resulting insistence on what appears irrelevant, and intolerance of other schools of thought, frequently repel an essentially realist

and tolerant generation: it is felt that the churches have confounded truth with *the* truth, and have honestly but blindly mistaken the second for the first: whereas it is truth, without prefix or suffix, that this sincere and open-eyed generation wistfully seek: it is a God-centred religion for which they ask, and not, as they so often *find*, a religion-centred God. Thus, much has been stolen from the Church, and much has been lost through its own limitations and obscurantism. But though much is taken, much remains: and the chief thing that remains to the Church as educator is that it should *speak about God*. That is the prime teaching business of the Church, as it is its God-sent opportunity: at present the business is often neglected, and the opportunity lost.

It is the prime business of the Church, because only by its due performance can that religious background be provided for life, which alone makes sense of it: and that is perhaps the most important part of education. "What is the sense of it?" is a natural question for a boy to ask, and he asks it of many things that are presented to him for his

acceptance, and he asks it of truth, beauty, and goodness. What is the sense of these things? They are not self-authenticating: truth is often burdensome and inconvenient, beauty a mere frill and of no practical importance, and goodness contravened by plain common sense. Yet these three are constantly put forward, in class-room or playing-field or chapel alike, as good and desirable. Why is that? They need some sanction and justification. The sanction of self-interest, an extraordinarily popular sanction to-day, will quite as commonly justify deceit, ugliness, and evil: nor will consideration for the good of others, if indeed that can be accepted without a religious motive, invariably sanction the aspirations and the conduct which we desire. Neither selfishness nor unselfishness supplies the sanction for which we look: the only sanction is to be found in a theology, and that means speaking about God. If that is done, not only are truth, goodness, and beauty placed in an unassailable position, but the unreal and damaging distinction between religious and secular vanishes like the mist before the sun: the truth pursued in class-room

studies, the accuracy of mathematics, the loveliness of great art, the beauties of literature, the harmonies of music, the fascination of a hobby, the discipline and the self-discipline of daily experience, the self-denial of a game, the kindness of a friend—all these things are seen to be good because they are the attributes of that Divine Being, in whom we live and move, and from whom we have our being. That is true religious education for it means that only one subject (a co-ordinating subject) will be taught in every school—and that religion. But the first impulse must come from the Church, whose duty it is to speak about the Divine Being, and unless that impulse is given there will be no movement.

But besides being the business of the Church, this is also, as I have said, its great opportunity, for if it is performed, it will answer to one of our deepest needs, and particularly to one of the deepest needs of the young. " Man's deepest need, as man ", says that distinguished scientist, Professor Julian Huxley, " is to discover something, some being or power, some force or tendency, which is moulding the destinies of the world—something not himself,

greater than himself, with which he yet feels that he can harmonize his nature, in which he can repose his doubts, through faith in which he can achieve confidence and hope." One of the most remarkable characteristics of young people to-day is their wistful searching for authority somewhere—somewhere, where they can repose their doubts. It is indeed a characteristic of us all, but it is particularly marked in the young. It is enhanced by the increasing complexity of modern life. Even in Victorian times the problem was comparatively simple : certain truths were commonly accepted as axiomatic, man seemed largely in control of his environment, and where he was not and where difficulties arose, the belief in a future life could always render their discussion irrelevant and a waste of time. It may be that the sufferings of the present time may drive mankind back to such a belief, as the Jews were driven to their conception of a Messianic kingdom as a compensation for their unintelligible and intolerable failures. But that is not yet—there is no such stabilizing faith among us. Rather, the whole world is at sixes and at sevens : we are in the grip of

forces that we can neither understand nor control : the experts are at variance in almost every field—industrial, economic, social, political, and religious : we are embarked on a rough and dangerous sea, the pilots are uncertain of their course, and the very stars are going out. God is mistaken for the Devil, and the Devil for God. Man knows not what to think, what to say, or what to do : and boys and girls, with that longing, which is always theirs, to feel firm ground beneath their feet, cry out :—" Show us an authority somewhere : give us a dictator ". And they are finding their dictators. It is noteworthy how many authoritarian movements draw their recruits from the ranks of the young : there is Communism in Russia, with the dictatorship of the common good—a religion which for many has displaced all other religion : there is Fascism in Italy and Nazi-ism in Germany, with the dictatorship of a man—to whom honours are paid not unlike those that were paid to the deified Roman emperors : there is Roman Catholicism, with the dictatorship of an ecclesiastical authority : there is Fundamentalism, with the dictatorship of a Book : there is

the Group movement, with the dictatorship of the Holy Spirit.[1] All these movements, be it noted, are either religious movements in fact, or have definitely religious characteristics. But it may be questioned whether any of them bear the fruits of true religion. Much of it is Dead Sea fruit. They leave their devotees dissatisfied, unhappy, and disillusioned : they endure for a time, but they are unable to save or to make whole. Herein lies the opportunity of the Church. It, and it alone, can satisfy this longing for authority, and can speak of One who makes sense of life, who resolves its perplexities, who makes a way through the trackless wilderness, who justifies our deepest longings, and who gives us strength for the journey—forty days and forty nights to the Mount of God. And if the Church will speak with that voice, the young are ready to listen.

Will it speak? Does it so speak to-day? The answer to that second question is largely No : the Church to-day tends to neglect its specific function, to fail in its true purpose—

[1] This, of course, is the Group's view : if it were universally accepted, it would solve our problem.

that for which it exists and for which young people will turn to it,—and to pursue other ends, ends of indubitable value to the community, but of secondary and not of primary importance to the Church itself and to the teaching of true religion. A Church in fact tends to suffer a sea-change into something else. To make this point clear, let us imagine for a moment the sudden abolition overnight of all the Churches and of all they stand for, their complete removal from our common life: and let us ask ourselves two questions—first, what *ought* we to miss to-morrow morning? and second, what in fact *should* we miss? There is no doubt that we *ought* to miss the prime source of our knowledge of God, the channel through which the revelation of His nature flows to mankind, the authentic tones of His voice speaking to us through His representatives, the leaders of His Church, about Himself. We ought to feel ourselves left empty of knowledge of the Divine, and with nowhere else to turn to in search of it. We ought to find ourselves suddenly bereft of the only sanction and justification for a moral rather than an immoral life: groping in the

darkness for an explanation, and with none to hold out a helping hand. But would that be our experience in fact? Is that the kind of thing we should *primarily* miss? Almost certainly, not; the answer to the second question is that we should primarily feel ourselves the poorer for the loss of many societies given up to good works. It is Martha we should miss rather than Mary: Martha, who is busy about many things—the promotion of sound ethics, the removal of social evils such as gambling and intemperance, the organization of charity and the ministering to the needs of others, the inculcation of the love of our neighbour (the second commandment) rather than the love of God (the first), the exposition and the promotion of good causes, such as the League of Nations—Martha, busy about many things and interested in all the details of daily conduct, and not Mary, busy only about one and interested in her Master and Lord: Martha, "cumbered" with her good works—and how good they are, but what an encumbrance!—and not Mary with her faith, which alone makes the good works intelligible and worth doing. Now all those activities of

Martha are important parts of the Church's work, and no Church would be worthy of the name which neglected them : but they tend to become preponderant, sometimes to the exclusion altogether of Mary—and then the Church has no longer any right to its title, and should choose some other. The religion of the Churches to-day, and especially, of the Nonconformist Churches, has been unkindly but not untruly described as " going about doing good, especially the kind of good that means plenty of going about ". That kind of good is important, but of secondary, not of primary importance, and other societies exist for the doing of all of it : but no other society exists to speak to us about God. Let us remember that it is God whom the young people are searching for, and they will not readily listen to a Church which habitually speaks to them not about Him but about man, not about the Creator but about the creature, not about faith but about works : " show me thy faith ", these young people may well say, " and then I will show thee my works ". And to show them its faith, without fear and without apology, is the contribution which the Church

can make to education to-day, as it has made many another contribution in the past. It was while I was engaged in writing these pages that I came across the following in a broadcast address by a young man: the address was one of a series under the title "The Church I look for", in which young men and young women of various denominations put forward what they expected from the Church of Christ: this speaker, an Anglican, said: "If there is one thing in general for which I would work and pray, it is that Christians should show forth more simply the faith of the Christian Church. We waste our energies in anxious attempts to make our faith scientific, or modern, or comfortable, or political, or sociological, or anything rather than a Gospel of Good News of salvation and redemption, a means of grace and a hope of glory. All these other matters, science, social service, a wise politic and a modern ethic, are admirable, but they are secondary things which come after and must be made consequential to the mission of the Church to show men the vision of God and to call them to pursue that vision . . . The message

which the world needs to-day is one that quite simply puts God first and allows all else to take its proper place in order beneath the primacy of the spiritual. So I should like the teaching of our pulpits and our religious literature to rest awhile from secondary matters, and to give to people, who will listen or read, the faith which has always been for nearly four hundred years the faith of the English Church: and the faith which since the days of the Apostles has been the Catholic faith." Later in the same series a speaker for the Church of Scotland said: "What about the Church's approach to the world? There is a suspicion that the Church has so completely come to terms with the world, that we have forgotten that there is such a thing as worldliness. There has been an attempt to compete with the world on its own plane. Our generation is rapidly tiring of Churches which seek to attract by competing with the popular Press, the sweepstake, or the music hall. We want a Church that is not ashamed to talk about God. The attempt to hold and gain members by extraneous means is reflected in our pulpits. We have

come to expect ministers to apologize for the supernatural—to explain away old miracles, instead of producing new ones. The Church has stood hat in hand in the ante-rooms of politics, philosophy, and science, instead of proclaiming her own living truths. Instead of sermons about God, we have had sermons about men. And we can get these better from the essayists." A final piece of evidence comes from a book recently published, called *Asking them Questions*. It consists of questions put to a clergyman in Edinburgh by members of a boys' club, and answered by eminent divines. And the significant thing is that nearly all the questions are theological and not ethical—" What is God like? ", and not " What must I do? "

But what is the faith that the Church is asked to proclaim? To answer that question would clearly lead us into regions outside the educational sphere which is the business of this book. But there are attitudes which I observe in boys to-day suggestive of two points. In the first place there is the need for authority, and the faith which will answer that need is the faith which is " reason grown courageous ",

and which is not afraid to lay down the law. The rational approach to religion, so fashionable to-day, has done much harm to the cause : God becomes no more compulsive than mathematical formulae or the law of relativity —and Sir James Jeans's mathematician behind the universe is a singularly uninspiring kind of deity, and one that will never turn the world upside down. It is not a mathematician, but a Law-giver that we want : and " Thus saith the Lord ", a word not to be argued about, is a word to this generation, and a word for which it is waiting, no less than it was a word to the Hebrew prophets of old. That must be one facet of our faith. In the second place we must emphasize the awe and the mystery of the Divine—

Closer is He than breathing,
Nearer than hands or feet.

Yes—but also sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and the whole earth is full of His glory. We have to recognize in the growing generation " a hard materialism, a blind trust in science, no spiritual conviction, no belief in any far-off, divine event: they cling to the adequacy of physical science to explain themselves and to

explain away the Deity, and by short-circuiting God they reduce the field of their duties to man."[1] The reason is partly their ignorance, for lack of instruction, and partly the superabundance of modern miracles, when every day adds to the number : miraculous achievement, and miraculous achievement *by man*, is a commonplace of every-day life : in their wonder at the seen they grow blind to the more splendid wonder of the unseen. Blind—but ready to see if once it is put before them : and the everlasting miracle of life and thought, the very miracle that man can achieve these miraculous results, a miracle that is derived from the awful and mysterious being of God Himself, is the best antidote to this deleterious drug of modern materialism. That, then, is the second aspect of God which the Church must not be afraid to emphasize.

It would be possible to point to certain reasons why the Church to-day fails in this its chief teaching capacity, but a consideration of that question would be strictly irrelevant to our main theme. I would, however,

[1] *Fathers and Sons*, by E. B. Castle. University of London Press.

tentatively, throw out two suggestions. The first is that the whole system of recruitment and training for the ministry of God needs overhauling, and that we must attract a more scholarly type and train them in more scholarly ways. We are here in a vicious circle. In schools there are very few boys contemplating the ministry as their calling in life, and those few by no means the best. If they have personal ambitions, they see little prospect of satisfying them in the Church : if they have ideals of social betterment and a desire to serve their generation, they see more scope for practical activity in other spheres : if they have brains, they fear the cramping limitations of creed and formula. Many of these latter are sincerely anxious to enter the ministry, but they are not anxious to enter the ministry of any particular denomination : this may seem an impossible and utopian ambition, but it is a real one and one for which provision should be made. Doubtless in due time they are likely to find their spiritual home in one denomination or another : but on the threshold of life, disgusted by inter-denominational differences and frightened by denominational

demands on their beliefs if not on their credulity, they are anxious to enter the ministry of God rather than the ministry of this or that Church. The solution of that dilemma is to be found in the foundation of theological colleges, untrammelled by the demands of any Church: devoted not to the training of priests and ministers for the Anglican or Congregational or Baptist Communions, but for the ministry of God's word: dedicated not to the maintenance of some particular creed or form of Church organization, but dedicated in all freedom to Truth, Liberty, and Religion; and in the multiplication of such colleges up and down the land. There is no reason why such colleges should not exist: and never was such an opportunity offered to the religious leaders of any generation, as would be offered to the authorities of such places of learning. For it is the *thinking* men who are wanted in the Church, and it is the *thinking* men whom such colleges would attract and train. My second suggestion is of quite a different nature. It is that the doctrine of the Incarnation has hampered the Church in its exposition of God's nature. I do not refer to the difficulty of

accepting the doctrine—a difficulty which is not felt by thousands of human souls, and is indeed just the kind of doctrine which reason grown courageous may justifiably put forward. But this doctrine, by bringing God down to earth as a man among men, "emptied" Him (in the words of the Epistle to the Philippians) of much of His majesty and awe: "He made Himself", as the authorized version translates the same passage, "of no reputation." And the emphasis on this aspect of the Godhead which has been made by so many Churches, so that it is commonly described as the foundation-stone of religion, by making Him of no reputation, has rendered Him too familiar. The doctrine has, of course, a unique value, and puts into a striking form the truth of God's immanence: but it is a doctrine which can only with safety be emphasized, if the picture of God "high and lifted up" is not forgotten: and that sometimes has been forgotten, and is forgotten to-day.

Such, then, is the educational function of the Church. If the function is performed, much will be won besides the points to which I have drawn attention. Our boys and girls

will find not only an authority at the centre, an anchor for their souls in the drifting seas of life, the solution of their puzzles and the sanction for their morals, the law-giver whose voice they can obey, the Unseen who is more wonderful than the seen, the antidote to their unhappy materialism and their self-destructive self-sufficiency—but also a vast range of incidental blessings: and perhaps above all, a true sense of values. False values are rampant, and lead to much of that vulgarity which curses us to-day: and so long as man is the measure of all things, they are likely to continue. Vulgarity is desecrating the face of England, spoiling its manners, contaminating its music, its literature, and its art. And it is largely bred of ignorance—ignorance of what is truly good and truly beautiful. It is indeed a form of that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, which is the only unforgivable sin, the taking of good for evil and of evil for good. And it is surely by the Holy Spirit alone that it can be cured. It is not fanciful to say that the cure for this disease is to be found in religious education. But that education must, of course, be given to young and

old alike. In this chapter we have been concerned with the Church's duty to the young: but it has a duty to the adult also, and if it is true of education in general that it is a life-long process, and that only he who on the edge of the grave can look back without remorse and look forward without fear may consider himself an educated man, this is true to the highest degree of religious education which is the work of the Church.

CHAPTER IV

THE WORK OF EDUCATION: THE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER IV

THE WORK OF EDUCATION: THE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY

WE have studied the contribution to be expected from the home and the Church to the making of a citizen, and have seen that the family is the true school of civic virtues, and that the teaching Church, if it is true to itself, will provide the future citizen with that authority which he needs and which otherwise he may well find in anti-social directions: with a sense of true values, without which he will vulgarize life: with an antidote to that self-sufficient materialism, which destroys nations as it destroys individuals, which destroyed Ancient Rome as it may well destroy twentieth century Europe: and with that spiritual background, that vision, without which the people perish. All these things are very much the concern of the State, and to home and Church it must look for their fulfilment.

We now approach the third chief educational agency which it must use—the school and the university. It may well be thought that in virtue of the value of their contribution to the making of a citizen, these should have come first. Personally, I should be hard put to it to assess the comparative values of the three in this work. The educational work of the first two, however, is only part of a wider and richer activity, while the school exists solely for this work, and the university certainly, despite its non-educational functions, to a greater degree than either of the two other. We are thus approaching the most extensive, if not the most important, part of our survey.

It is, of course, impossible to deal with the subject exhaustively in two chapters. To do so would involve a preliminary study of child psychology and of the various stages of growth through which a child passes—the stage of infancy, the play-time stage from about two to eight, the period of stability when play and reality are found to be disparate and when the shades of the prison house begin to close upon the growing boy, and then, after a brief transition period, all the stress and strain of

adolescence. We should have to consider the precise type of educational activity appropriate to each of these stages, and to their manifold sub-divisions. A survey would be necessary of the different types of schools—the nursery schools, which so badly need multiplication : the kindergartens, which are a kind of enlarged home : primary and secondary schools, with the age of transition and the method of selection : co-educational schools, which create as many problems as they solve : day schools which, when rooted in a locality and intimately bound up with the life of the community, are one of the finest educational instruments we have, but which when divorced from the locality and drawing their pupils from a distance, lose their *locus standi*, and are of much more questionable value : technical schools and continuation and industrial schools, the only schools where vocational instruction has a proper place : and that strange exotic growth, undefinable and some think indefensible, the public boarding school, living a life of semi-monastic seclusion, often in the depths of the country, by most of the canons of logic doomed to failure, but

adolescence. We should have to consider the precise type of educational activity appropriate to each of these stages, and to their manifold sub-divisions. A survey would be necessary of the different types of schools—the nursery schools, which so badly need multiplication: the kindergartens, which are a kind of enlarged home: primary and secondary schools, with the age of transition and the method of selection: co-educational schools, which create as many problems as they solve: day schools which, when rooted in a locality and intimately bound up with the life of the community, are one of the finest educational instruments we have, but which when divorced from the locality and drawing their pupils from a distance, lose their *locus standi*, and are of much more questionable value: technical schools and continuation and industrial schools, the only schools where vocational instruction has a proper place: and that strange exotic growth, undefinable and some think indefensible, the public boarding school, living a life of semi-monastic seclusion, often in the depths of the country, by most of the canons of logic doomed to failure, but

turning out a constant stream of citizens able to do efficiently things they have never done before: perhaps that definition of the value of education—that it enables you to do a thing you've never done before—once given by a cook to her mistress when she made a pudding at which the cook had conspicuously failed—is the most satisfying definition we can get. We should have to study what Cardinal Newman, during the hot controversies of the forties, called "The Idea of a University". And we should have to go into interminable details of curricula and the examination system, of organization and administration. Only so could the ground be adequately covered. I propose in this chapter to confine myself to a statement of the general principles involved in all school and university work, which I shall try to illustrate from practice in certain selected types of school: for the next chapter I shall reserve a more detailed consideration of the contribution to be made to the education of a citizen by the particular and traditional school subjects and activities.

The schoolmaster then is charged with the duty of reconciling and fusing into one

the diverse aspirations of child, parent, and society. " You do not educate a man ", said Ruskin, " by telling him what he knows not, but by making him what he was not " : and for the child the school has to make him into a wage-earner, for the parent into a realized personality (the business of education is to give every child's soul its chance), and for society into a citizen. This may be put shortly by saying that the school's business is to discover and to make effective a unique personality, and it is from beginning to end a venture of faith—a venture of faith in the existence and in the potentiality of that personality. Without that faith the work of the teacher becomes purely mechanical, and it is when the faith is lost that the class-room becomes a prison house for teacher and taught alike, and the whining schoolboy is seen, creeping like snail unwillingly to school. The personality, moreover, it may be repeated, is to be treated as one, and not departmentalized : it is indeed the co-education of mind, body, and character that is the objective : otherwise the product will be an uneducated human being, for there is no educated mind

in an uneducated body, nor can an educated body house a wholly uneducated mind or spirit.

The first task then is a journey of exploration and discovery, and it is indeed an *incognita terra* into which the journey is made : for the nature of it is unknown, not only to the leader and the members of the expedition, but to the very inhabitants of the land themselves. Children have to be taught to know themselves: it is my experience that only a minority, and a very small minority at that, have any accurate notion of where their true interests lie and their real contribution is to be made, before the age of sixteen or seventeen : they often think they know long before this, but they are nearly always mistaken, and they discover their mistake for themselves later on. This is, of course, a most convincing argument for the raising of the school age, even beyond the pseudo-fifteen which it has now reached : I doubt whether anybody can tell, be he parent, local authority, or the boy himself, what is "beneficial employment" before the age of sixteen at least. The discovery, then, that has to be made is a self-discovery by the

child, and the material and the environment for it has to be supplied by the teacher: and in this respect both teacher and taught are alike learners. The material and the environment are to be found in the activities of the school, and opportunity must be given for contact to be made with life at as many points as possible, for it is by contact and not by precept that this first lesson is learnt. It will be surprising if in a good school there does not emerge some prospect that pleases. *Placeo—Doceo—Moveo:* Attraction—Instruction—and Inspiration; that is an old statement of the course of education, and this is the stage of *Placeo*. Something to please, which shall afterwards become something to live by, may well be found among the ordinary subjects of the curriculum: or in games and physical exercises: or in some minor position of responsibility: or in the library, or from a lecture: or in contact with some cultural interest, suddenly blazing out before a great picture or a piece of music: or through some hobby or spare-time occupation—and that all schools should make provision for that, setting aside

a time when every child may do what he likes so long as it is worth doing, is of fundamental importance to education. These are the kind of fruitful contacts that may be made, and schools are making them far more than they used to do: public and secondary schools organize lectures, concerts, and art exhibitions: teach the proper use of a library: arrange expeditions to social clubs and industrial concerns in the neighbourhood: send their boys to working-camps with the unemployed in the holidays: hold hobby exhibitions and award hobby prizes. Nor are the primary schools behind: I know of one in the country where the schoolmaster takes his pupils into the fields during an eclipse of the sun, and divides them into groups, each to observe and record a different phenomenon—the progress of the eclipse itself, the drop in the temperature, the song of the birds, the behaviour of the animals: who, whenever a well is being dug in the neighbourhood, is on the spot with a party of his boys to pick up what relics there may be—and there are many Roman relics: who calls in the gypsies from the common to teach the

lore of the woods and the heaths, and their cunning country crafts. Thus fascinating contacts are made with the life of the countryside, and it may well be that a pearl of great price will be discovered in a field, for which a boy will sell all that he has. That is the stuff of real education, and *Placeo* dominates the scene.

In this way a two-fold discovery may be made, important to pupil, to parent, and to society alike. The first may well be the discovery of how to make a living. This does not mean that such schools should be vocational: that is the work of the technical school. And yet, there is a constant attempt by various callings to capture the schools for their own purposes—a misguided attempt, for were it to succeed, it would immeasurably lower the standard of recruits. "The child", says Professor J. J. Findlay, "must be so instructed as to be able to earn his bread, and at the present day when science, transportation, politics have transformed the adult world of manufacture and commerce, the schools are summoned to 'wake up'. In spite of the teacher's affection for culture, he is hustled

into the market-place and challenged to prove the value of his wares in terms of salary and dividend." This is an intrusion which every school must resist to the death : for we know, and happily the more enlightened employers know, that our business is to turn out men and women capable of performing efficiently whatever life may demand of them, not skilled craftsmen but skilled human beings : we know that our future engineer will be a good engineer not because of his specialization in mathematics and drawing, but because of "his free general growth in an atmosphere, intellectual and social, which suits his nature" : and that in the final analysis it is quality of mind that counts, and not technical skill. That will come later, for in this world you can only learn to do a thing by doing it : any other learning is like trying to learn to swim by going through the motions without any water. But despite this non-vocational emphasis, an accidental by-product of so full a life may well be the discovery of a life-work which will be at once worthy and satisfying.

The second discovery that will be made is the discovery of some leisure-time pursuit :

if the first is the earning of bread, the second is the earning of that something more than bread alone by which man lives : if the first is a living for the body, the second is a living for the soul. They may in rare cases be identical, and happy is the man whose work is also his hobby. But they are more likely to be different, and the need for some occupation, creative or re-creative, to fill leisure hours becomes more vital as those leisure hours increase. What are we to do when we work for only four hours a day? We may have recourse to those ready-made amusements which are so cheap and so easily obtained : but of these we shall observe that many are anti-social in their effects (I should class racing and certain cinema programmes among these), and of others we can never estimate the anti-social effects in the conditions of labour which they impose. Or we can make our own amusements—a game to play and not to watch, birds to observe, flowers to collect, a home-made boat to sail in, photographs of our family, music from our own piano, and pictures—not from a Picture Palace, but from our own brush. There is nothing anti-social

in these activities: they rather enrich society, and herein lies the true importance of encouraging hobbies at school. It may well be that the greatest nation of the future will be the nation that has best learnt the proper use of its leisure. "The soul", said Erasmus, "is dyed the colour of its leisure thoughts": and we may add that a nation is dyed the colour of its leisure occupations.

What, then, is to be done when these discoveries have been made? After *Placeo—Doceo*. What are we to teach? There is a modern school of thought which says that we must concentrate exclusively on the results of our discoveries: find out what a child likes doing, and will therefore do best, and let him do that. That is the doctrine underlying many so-called "Free" schools, where the discipline and the choice of subjects is alike free, and where all work is play. It is a doctrine which was immensely popular just after the war, but which has since waned in popularity. And the reason why it has waned in popularity is because its essential truth was exaggerated, till it occupied the whole field and there was no room left for

any other truth: and one vital truth which was thus neglected is the truth that life offers no such unchartered freedom, that the "play-way" is not the way of hand-to-mouth existence which we must all follow. Life demands from every son of man uncongenial work, and submission to a discipline which he may find irksome: and it will be a bad school that does not prepare its pupils for such inescapable conditions. Early specialization on the congenial is pernicious educational doctrine. Enough has been said to indicate that the importance of discovering for each child the right way in which it should go, is here fully recognized—and when the discovery is made there must be every encouragement to follow that way. But while it is being made, and after it is complete, the harder way to be followed, willy nilly, by every man, woman, and child, must not be forgotten: we shall continue to teach languages to the mathematician and mathematics to the linguist, Latin grammar to the scientist and chemistry to the historian: for these subjects, apart altogether from the intellectual atmosphere which their study will create, may

well provide in the circumstances just that disciplined management of the uncongenial without which there can be no true citizenship. They are described often as " useless subjects " : useless they may be to the specialist, but their very uselessness is their highest usefulness to the citizen.

Thus the discovery is made, the personality comes to light, and the essential lessons of life are taught. But there is a further part of the schoolmaster's task—to render that personality *effective*. This is based on the jigsaw theory of life to which I referred in my first chapter : each personality is a piece in the puzzle, and must make its effective contribution to the whole picture : it can only do that by being itself, and for itself there is a place in the pattern of society. For the teacher this is the third stage—*Moveo :* it is the stage of impulse, movement, and inspiration. The first thing to be done is to give every child faith in himself : " the fearful unbelief ", said Carlyle, " is unbelief in yourself " and after self-discovery must come self-confidence—a feeling that we are wanted and can do something useful. Modern conditions

in trade and industry, increasing mechanization and the reduction of the individual to a mere pawn in the game, make this difficult : but we shall remember that no game was ever won without its pawns (they sometimes become Queens), and the nature of childhood will itself do much to counteract the difficulty. All who have had to do with boys and girls know how keen they are to make themselves useful—it is indeed one of their most attractive characteristics : there is never any lack of volunteers when there is an obviously useful bit of work to be done. That is a disposition which is often allowed to evaporate as the child gets older—its evaporation is indeed encouraged by an extravagant generosity in certain types of school : but if we would avoid the tragedy of useless lives, we must, in these days when in all types of school so much is done for children, make a deliberate effort to keep it alive by seeing that they do more things for themselves. In this way we shall have a much better chance of moving them, when they leave school, to make their contribution to the life they enter. That contribution—the contribution of a piece in a

jigsaw puzzle—means first fitting in, living in harmony with one's environment. It means, as I have indicated, doing uncongenial work and submitting to possibly irksome discipline. It means also neighbourliness, and there is an argument here for a greater mixing of classes in all our schools. A common charge against the public schools is that they are class schools: this charge is not nearly so well founded to-day as it was at the beginning of the century: Dr Norwood has pointed out that these schools, with the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, to which they lead on, probably represent a better cross-section of society than any other educational institutions: I should, nevertheless, like to see them leavened with a larger number of entrants from the elementary schools—probably with the assistance of public money. It is, in my experience, the product of the *secondary* school who is most exclusive and class-conscious, and class-consciousness certainly never means good neighbourliness. There must be a cure for this, if we are to achieve effective citizenship: a selfish individualism is hopelessly inadequate. Such

effective citizenship means also accepting the standards of society without surrendering our ideals. This strikes me as an interesting point. A boy is taught at school to set before himself the highest ideals of truthfulness and morality: "schools are maintained because men want their children to set their affections on what is worthiest": "no decent person", these children are told, "would ever do such and such a thing." Yet, when they leave school, they find "decent people", not only doing "such and such a thing", but things far worse, and accepted by their fellows as honourable and respectable members of society. What is to be done in this dilemma? Are the ideals to be surrendered as too highly coloured? Are they after all only a kind of bee-in-the-bonnet from which a schoolmaster suffers? Or are they to be maintained in a superior aloofness to our fellow men? Either solution is fatal. The colours on the jigsaw-piece must not be washed out, to tone in with the others which are paler: they must lie there cheek-by-jowl with them. Adaptation, without the surrender of the essential, is one of the lessons we must teach at school.

But after all, to live in harmony with his environment is a very small and a negative contribution for the individual to make to society. There must be something more positive than that: he must add something, make some bit of the picture which would never be there but for him. "Man", says Professor Woodbridge, "is not content to take nature as he finds her: he insists on making her over." But it is only rebellious man who feels like that, "not content" because of the divine discontent within him, that divine discontent which was the moving passion in the Master-Rebel of all time, Jesus Christ Himself. So we must educate rebels at school, nonconformists to the complacently-accepted abuses of the time. The character of an age means by derivation its distinctive marks, scratched on the surface of time: and it is only such a rebel who will add his distinctive mark to the rest, and contribute to the character. To train rebels may sound dangerous educational doctrine—and so it would be if it meant the training of rebels who only desire to pull down, and not to build up, or political rebels against the established order

of things: certainly school is no place for such propaganda, and the critics are right who protest when they see signs of it. But there are plenty of abuses against which every man of goodwill should instinctively rebel—unemployment and slums, disease and infant mortality, jerry building (which is the creation of the slums of the future) and ribbon development, the hideous toll of the roads, bribery and corruption in local administration, sweated labour, war-mongering for private profit: the list might be extended indefinitely. These are the rulers of the darkness of this world, the spiritual wickedness in high places, against which we wrestle. But do we wrestle enough? Do we not rather accept them, and look to some other body—that shadowy entity the State, for choice—to do something about it? The lesson which we must teach in school is that these matters are the personal responsibility of each and all. In this we shall have certain things on our side and certain things against us. On our side there will be the natural rebelliousness of youth, and all its high and generous ideals. On the other side we have the force of tradition, particularly

strong perhaps in public schools, and the deadening hand of custom. I believe that most boys in their early days have a considerable fund of social idealism, but that in the individual and collective insecurity of modern life this rapidly degenerates into a policy of safety-first. We can only counteract this by a deliberate policy at school. It will involve first, definite teaching about the contemporary world. History must not stop short with the Napoleonic wars. It is the history of to-day that matters, the history that is in the making, and that these boys and girls in our classrooms are destined to make fair or foul. There must be a fearless putting forward of the facts about the world to-day: I say "fearless" because Education Authorities often fight shy of this kind of teaching, being afraid of bias in the teacher: but that bias must be risked—and after all has any good teacher ever taught any subject without bias? Discussion, free and open, of these facts must be encouraged, the newspapers and wireless made use of, and first-hand acquaintance with as many as possible of the problems established. That would give the necessary foundation of knowledge.

On the top of that must come the inculcation of personal responsibility for what happens, and of personal responsibility towards one's neighbours. This is much more indefinite and more difficult to achieve: but it will spring naturally out of the teaching, and more particularly the teaching of history, if that is competently given: it will be the result partly, doubtless, of precept, in talks at school services and on similar occasions: it will be fostered above all by the general tone and atmosphere of the school. What is known sometimes as a "well-disciplined school", where the system is so rigid that abuses are perpetuated as well as virtues, where the traditions are maintained in a museum (the house of the dead) and not in a zoological garden (where live things grow), and where the individual is so much a cog in the machine that there is no hope for him escaping from his appointed sphere of revolution and influencing the direction in which the machine is running—such a school (and they are not rare), while preserving outward and visible signs of great efficiency, has but few of the inward and spiritual graces: above all it is

lacking in the grace of personal responsibility. It is a poor training ground for contributory and effective citizenship. The divine discontent is discountenanced: the rebel is punished—even when his rebellion is directed against spiritual wickedness in high places: and the product of such a school is likely to be efficient automata rather than effective citizens. We desire rather a wise combination of discipline and freedom, with an infusion of self-government. The discipline must be maintained, for life is always a disciplined adventure: and pure self-government, popular in some modern schools, must be avoided, for that is not only beyond the capacity of immature minds and characters, but is also a poor preparation for the experience of adult life. But the individual must be made to feel that he counts: that if things are going wrong he has at any rate the chance, even if he lacks the wisdom or courage, to put them right: that the well-being of the whole depends not on the successes of those who win scholarships or athletic distinctions, but on the personal efforts of himself: and that to help a lame dog over a stile is as important in its way as

to win his First Eleven Colours. Many practical steps may be taken to bring about this desirable combination of discipline and freedom—the multiplication of posts of minor responsibility is one—but however brought about its effect on producing the kind of citizen we need will be profound. There will be far more boys and girls leaving school inspired by the long and honourable record of voluntary public service performed by our countrymen, to perform some such service themselves: far more public school boys taking a part in local politics—a most crying need to-day: far more prepared to organize Boy Scout troops, to manage clubs, or—if they are doctors or lawyers—to give free medical or legal advice in some slum parish: far more athletes ready to devote their time and energies to seeing that the national playing-fields are extended, rather than to adorning their own club field themselves: far more, in fact, imbued with a feeling of responsibility towards their neighbour, and a conviction that their individual contribution (however insignificant it may seem) will count.

It is, then, along these lines that the schoolmaster can pursue his task of discovering and making effective a unique personality. For the great majority of our boys and girls it must be done by him, if it is to be done at all : for the great majority will not see the inside of a university : for them the only post-school education will be the haphazard education of life itself, and though life has often been regarded as the great school of mankind, it is a ruthless school, whose methods are irresponsible and indefensible : any school in the strict sense, which was guilty of such wastage of the lives committed to it, would have to close its doors within a week. Meanwhile, the extent of university work increases every year. This is done partly by putting back on to the schools work which is really the business of the university : this is a regrettable tendency, and may lead to an increase in premature specialization at the expense of true education : to take a solitary example, it is customary nowadays for a boy to take his first M.B. examination, and sometimes part of the second, before leaving school : that used to be university work, and rightly

so, and such professional examinations have no place at the school stage. At the same time there has been a welcome increase in the number and size and scope of provincial universities and university colleges. This is all to the good, and means a chance of a university education for an increasing number of boys and girls. The danger seems to be that such institutions should be too firmly rooted in their locality, and that a certain narrow parochialism should result: it is important that they should draw their students from as wide an area as possible. A university, to justify its name, must be universal.

The university may be considered under two aspects. It is, in the first place, a teaching institution: as such it carries on the work of the school in educating a personality, and its prime responsibility is to the pupil. But secondly it is a research institution, engaged in the pursuit of truth: as such it is doing work quite other than that done in the schools, its prime responsibility is to the subject and not to the pupil, and it is only interested in the latter as a co-operator in research: it may be added, however, that in this capacity

it indirectly teaches the value of co-operative work, a lesson of inestimable importance to society. As a teaching institution the university is concerned with the conservation and the interpretation of the past: the value of the past to any society needs no stressing, with the lessons to be learnt from it, and the direction it may give to the future: "one does not learn history", says Herr Hitler, "merely to know what has been, but in order to have a taskmaster for the future": and the past of the society of mankind (which is the business of the university), with the pictures it gives of the birth, growth, maturity, and death of complete civilizations, is of no less importance to society—indeed in our rapidly shrinking world, it is of greater importance—than national history to a nation. The university teaches further the lesson of how to think: the processes of clear, independent, and logical thinking have all to be taught, and though the lessons (as we shall see in the next chapter) may be begun at school, it is in the wider world of the university that they find their real opportunity. And with that goes the lesson of how to apply the

knowledge that has been gained: education has been defined by Professor Whitehead as "the art of the utilization of knowledge", an art which can best be taught at the university stage. There is, moreover, another severely practical lesson to be learnt at this stage: it is the lesson of *independent* work, and the organization of time: it is one of the weaknesses of the school system that it sends out its pupils almost entirely untrained in this vital qualification for effective citizenship. And lastly, there is the teaching achieved through contacts—the teaching, indeed, which is not the work of any tutor or lecturer, but the reciprocal work on one another of the students themselves, not proceeding from any lecture room but from undergraduate societies and undergraduate fire-sides: perhaps the most effective teaching work that the university does. "Companionship", said Lord Morley of his Oxford days, "was more than lectures," and it is, as those who have experienced it know, companionship of a peculiar type. It is a companionship of the living with one another, drawn from all classes of the community and thus differing from the companionship

offered by any school in the country: uninhibited by the herd-instinct, so powerful and so cramping an influence in school society: and enjoyed in an atmosphere of freedom, where a man is judged on his merits, and on his merits alone. There is no place where the individual has a better chance for his own self-development, where the unique personality has a better chance of making itself felt. Oxford and Cambridge are probably the two most democratic institutions of our time. But with this chance for the individual, there go the healthy limitations of a society. For this is a companionship also, in Burke's phrase, of the "living with the dead, and with those who are to be born", and the pattern of the past is nowhere else so clearly seen, nor the pattern to be made in the future so vividly recognized. There is a restraining influence from the one, and a sense of responsibility for the other. This companionship is a freemasonry of those who have been, those who are, and those who will be: and such a freemasonry is an education in itself.

Such is the university as teacher, and its value to society will have been apparent at

every step. In many of these steps it has merely been carrying forward the work of the schools, but carrying that forward, it may be remarked, in the spheres of the mind and spirit, and not in the sphere of the body. Physical education has not yet achieved university recognition. In some of the provincial universities, some small provision is made, but at Oxford and Cambridge none : Oxford does not even possess a gymnasium ! Nowhere has the matter yet been taken seriously enough. Its neglect arises from a certain contempt for the body, as compared with the mind, and from a misconceived notion that the latter only is a proper object for *education.* We are learning, however,—and the schools are showing the way—that the two must be educated together, and on equally scientific principles : and the time has come for the universities to establish honours courses in physical education. When that is done, it will be one of the biggest steps forward that we have taken in education for many years.

As an institution of research the university serves society in quite a different, but no less effective, way. Young and old co-operate

in the search for truth: the value of their co-operation I have already mentioned: all human progress is at bottom man's disciplined and disinterested co-operation in pursuit of an ideal, and in research work we see this process in being: it is indeed a pattern on which to fix our eyes. But the ideal here is truth—not for what it brings but for what it is: the research worker in Faraday's words, "is not a respecter of persons, but of things"; and he is prepared to welcome truth which shatters all his ideas and ideals, and brings his world crumbling to pieces around him. And the value to society of such a temper, in a time when every absolute is unthinkingly sacrificed to a relative and men are left with but little to live by, is incalculable. "This is true, though the heavens fall"—a society which will not listen to that voice, which is the voice of God, has no sure foundations. The point has been put by Alfred Noyes, speaking of Science:

What is all science then,
But pure religion, seeking everywhere
The true commandments, and through many
forms

The eternal Power that binds all worlds in one?
It is man's age-long struggle to draw near
His Maker, learn His thoughts, discern His law—
A boundless task, in whose infinitude,
As in the unfolding light and law of love,
Abides our life, and our eternal joy.

That is the temper of every sincere seeker after truth, and in it abides our life, of individuals and peoples alike. And with the flaming truth, the university also holds aloft the torch of learning in the dark ages, and this may well be one such. A dividend in pounds, shillings, and pence, to be paid now and at no distant future, is demanded as justification for most of our activities, and such a dividend pure learning will never show: are we then to surrender it? are we not rather to cultivate it with all our energies, not only as a thing eternally good in itself, but as holding within itself the secrets of the future? In the ever-living, ever-working universe, the seed of learning can never die, but will one day, in unexpected fashion, become a tree to shelter man from the storm and the heat, or on which he may climb, and from its topmost branches catch a glimpse of the pinnacles of the eternal City of God.

CHAPTER V

THE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY

(Continued)

CHAPTER V

THE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY

(Continued)

WE have seen what are the general implications in the three-fold educational process of *Placeo*, *Doceo*, *Moveo*, how all three contribute to the development of an effective personality, and what is the immediate objective at each stage. We must, however, come to closer grips with the subject. What, in more precise terms, is the type of personality (with the necessary safeguards for individuality) which we would send out into the world? How is the objective at each stage to be attained? Are we to devise new methods and new subjects, or are we to utilize those of proved educational worth? If the latter, how are we to adapt them for the purpose we have in view? Much that is here said in answer to these questions concerns particularly the schools, but most of it can be extended *mutatis mutandis* to the university as a teaching institution.

T. H. Huxley describes a liberal education as follows: "That man", he says, "has had a liberal education who has been so trained in youth that his body is the ready servant of his will, and does with ease and pleasure all the work that, as a mechanism, it is capable of: whose intellect is a clear, cold, logic engine, with all its parts of equal strength and in smooth working order: ready, like a steam engine, to be turned to any kind of work, and spin the gossamers as well as forge the anchors of the mind: whose mind is stored with a knowledge of the great and fundamental truths of Nature and of the laws of her operations; one who, no stunted ascetic, is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will; the servant of a tender conscience; who has learned to love all beauty, whether of nature or of art, to hate all vileness, and to respect others as himself." There are some gaps in that statement, the tones of the scientist's voice are clearly heard, and it is only by implication that religious teaching is included. But I venture to think that we should go far before we found a more satisfying definition of the

effective citizen, and I propose to enquire how as teachers we may fulfil this aim.

First, then, of the body, and I make no apology for amplifying what I have already hinted at more than once in the matter of physical education. The body must be "the ready servant of the will", and must do "with ease and pleasure all the work that it is capable of". In how many of us is that ideal realized? Apart altogether from unnecessary ill-health, the lot of so many, and preventable not by a bottle of medicine but by sensible education, of how many can it truly be said that the body is the ready servant of the will, and not rather the will the unwilling servant of the body? There are many good things that we would do if we had the physical capacity for them, but which remain undone, to the loss of the body politic, for lack of that capacity. We cannot watch any typical city crowd, and not feel that but few of its round-shouldered, under-sized, flat-footed, bespectacled component parts, are going about their business "with ease and pleasure": but few of that unhappy-looking multitude are finding their bodies anything but a burden to them. And when

the urge of beauty is strong within us, how many of us have the skill to create a beautiful thing?—like the artificer and the workmaster in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, who "put their trust in their hands, and each becometh wise in his own work": and "though they sit not in the councils of the mighty, yet without these shall not a city be inhabited, nor shall men sojourn or walk up and down therein: for these maintain the fabric of the world, and in the handiwork of their craft is their prayer." The answer to the questions I have put would be a depressing one: long and tragic would be the tale of unrealized physical capacity: we are surrounded on every side with untaught bodies, which are no less unfitted for constructive citizenship than untaught minds. The fault is to be laid at the doors of our schools and colleges. Until quite recent years, we have concentrated on the mind in education, and have left the body to take care of itself. This may surprise those who remember the common criticism made against our schools that we pay too much attention to athletics: but the tendency to leave the body to take care of itself has been encouraged by that very traditional

worship of athletics, which has been a handicap rather than a help in physical education. "My boy has his games—what more does he want?" must have been the thought if not the expressed opinion of many a parent, and endorsed by many a schoolmaster. But experience shows that he wants much more. Games are, from a physical standpoint, entirely *un*educational, or if not, they are educational only by accident: it is, for instance, significant that a recent comparison between Post Office boys, the product mainly of elementary and secondary schools where games are played once a week, and public school boys, who play games every day of their school lives, was definitely in favour of the former. Games are invaluable for other purposes (they produce many of the moral qualities that effective citizenship demands), but not for the scientific education of the body. This must be carried out in physical education periods, as the education of the mind is carried out in class-room periods; and such physical education periods must not be occupied with the old type of so-called physical training, which considered always the class rather than the individual,

which aimed at "fitness" as an end in itself (a nonsensical conception), and which violated most of the elementary principles which guide educational practice. There must be in every school a Physical Education Department, ranking equally with the other departments into which school studies naturally fall: with a university-trained man of wide interests and sympathies in charge, who will see every boy regularly during his school career (the only member of the staff in that advantageous position), and whose duty it will be to promote to the highest the physical development of each individual. He will do this by studying the individual (and especially the weakling, of no particular interest to the serjeant-major, but of infinitely more importance to society than the athlete beloved of his heart); by so dividing his classes into small groups under boy leaders that each individual is doing something within his capacity all the time and thereby avoiding that inferiority complex from which so many suffered in the old days; by observing the well-known class-room principles of progressiveness in study, of laying firm foundations of ground-work before going on

to more spectacular heights, of relating all teaching to outside interests and outside strains and stresses, of keeping every member of the class busy all the time; by timely advice, particularly as the difficulties of adolescence approach; by having a say, with the school authorities, in such matters as food, sleep, and clothing, and by harmonious co-operation with the medical officer; and by inculcating in one and all an interest in fitness not as an end in itself, but as fitness for citizenship; a respect for the body, not only as a mechanism more worth keeping in order than the engine of a car, but also as the source of infinite pleasure and satisfaction; an understanding of the economics of muscular activity; and a sense of the poetry of all graceful movement. In order that he may achieve these ends, which experience in a few schools is showing can be achieved, I would have him intimately associated with all the skill-demanding and skill-producing extra-curricular activities of the school. They too are, at bottom, a department of physical education. The work must be begun early and go on late, and the primary and the preparatory school,

not less than the university, are called upon to co-operate. Nor would this only be physical education: the mind and the aesthetic susceptibilities are educated too, the character is strengthened, and a healthier outlook on life is engendered: we know little yet of the interaction of mind, body, and spirit, in the processes of education, but we are just beginning to collect the data, which will be of absorbing interest. The result of such a scheme as I have outlined would be a citizen much more capable of standing up to the unnatural strains of modern life, knowing how to fill his leisure hours with activities no less profitable to society than to himself, and perhaps above all a happy man, and as such the maker of a happy people. The movement has begun in the schools, and is likely to proceed with an increasing momentum and to lead to the chief reform in educational practice during the next ten years. Finance and a lack of trained teachers (particularly for boys' schools) are the chief obstacles in the way. The new system will clearly be more expensive than the old: we have to spend money on a new dress for Cinderella—but Cinderella is well worth

dressing, and in the long run is likely to be the most beautiful of the sisters. The lack of trained teachers is being partly made good by the Carnegie Physical Training College at Leeds, and will be still further helped by the proposed National College. There is an increasing number of young men anxious to-day to qualify themselves in this way: it is probably the most promising career open to recruits to the teaching profession. But many others need conversion, and in particular headmasters: experience has shown that without the convinced and enthusiastic support of the headmaster, little or nothing can be done. Perhaps the pressure of public opinion, aroused as it now is to the importance of this matter, and the force of events, may bring about such a conversion.

So much for the body. The intellect—that "clear, cold, logic engine"—must be *capable of thought*, and to teach clear and accurate thinking is one of the foremost duties of every school to-day. Never perhaps was there a greater need for it. On the one hand the citizen is expected to make up his mind and express it on a number of unprecedently

complicated problems—one of the consequences of a universal franchise and an imperial position. On the other hand he is surrounded by influences which make clear and accurate thinking a matter of the greatest difficulty. There is probably more muddled thinking and more thinking by proxy done to-day than ever before. Our boys and girls grow up in an atmosphere of loose expression and general statement, of evidence disregarded (particularly when it is negative evidence), of fact confounded with inference: a world in which prejudice is rampant, and the emotional associations of a word are often accepted instead of its real meaning: a world in which suggestibility is exploited to the full, and what "It" says on advertisement hoarding, newspaper headline, and "over the wireless last night" is readily accepted as a guarantee of truth. The only antidote to this is a school training in clear and accurate thinking. The two are not quite the same. Clear thinking is largely a matter of clear expression—a thought which cannot be intelligibly expressed is a thought of no value for effective citizenship. Thought and expression

must go hand in hand. English is clearly an important instrument here, and English not only in the specific English lessons, but in connection with every subject. What we have to do is to avoid vague and ambiguous terms, and to accept no general statement unless it is supported by factual evidence: to concentrate always on the concrete rather than the abstract: to condemn all irrelevance. If we can make these our guiding principles in all English teaching, we shall do much to encourage clear habits of thought: while in the teaching of science, to insist on a clear exposition of the experiment as of equal importance with the experiment itself, will work in the same direction. Other subjects can help, but they must all be subjects in which muddled thinking is possible: mathematics, for instance, in itself a model of clear thinking with unmistakable symbols, is for that very reason not so valuable in this connection as it is for the teaching of *accurate* thinking: languages are invaluable, and especially the classical languages—for putting a sentence of English into Latin, or vice versa, what "It" said over the wireless last night is of no help

at all—the only thing that matters is what the original writer said and, still more, what he *meant*, and that can only be arrived at by a dispassionate attention to the exact meaning of every word. History and literature, subjects infinitely liable to vague thought and muddled expression, may provide material for discussion which will conduce to the same end, and throughout their teaching the method of question and answer, the Socratic method, will be fruitful. These are the ways to be pursued in the class-room ; outside there are such activities as the Debating Society where similar lessons can be taught.

A training in accurate thinking means the fighting of mainly psychological enemies—the prejudice, the familiar groove, the misleading emotional association (as with the word "Bolshevik", for example, or "foreigner" or " Socialist " or " politician " or " parson "), suggestibility, the " masked " words of Ruskin, the " secret assassins " of Norman Angell, illogicalities and false inferences. Dr Thouless, in an Essay on this subject, has pointed out how one of the first requirements of accurate thinking is " the knowledge of, and expertness

in the use of, class terms". Classification is a difficult art to learn, in view of the notorious tendency of classes to overlap: but as instruments for teaching it the natural sciences are unrivalled. For a knowledge of logical principles we shall, of course, use mathematics, and try to "transfer" that knowledge (and a certain degree of transference seems to be possible, despite the psychological experts), from one subject to another. For the secret assassins there will be once more the classical and modern languages. And if we are wise we shall give much *direct* instruction, using the newspaper often as our medium, in the detection of sources of error: to analyse a leading article, to determine how much of it is founded on fact, how much the outcome of prejudice and dictated by the policy of the newspaper, what inferences are false, what canons of logic are broken, what is sound argument and what deceptive, what words say what they mean and what suggest something quite other—such an exercise is an attractive entertainment and highly instructive. Finally the Socratic dialogue will often do much to unmask the inconsistencies of our

own unexamined ideas. In such ways we shall attempt to train an intellect capable of forging the gossamers and the anchors of the mind, the intellect of a practical idealist, well defended against the almighty "It" of publicity (a voice loud enough, says Chesterton, to drown any remarks made by the public) and ready to turn to *any* kind of work that may be required of it.

Such are the methods for training the *intellect*. The *mind* is a different proposition. It must, according to Huxley, " be stored with a knowledge of the great and fundamental truths of Nature and of the laws of her operations ". Fully interpreted, this covers a vast field. It involves an understanding of the natural universe around us, which understanding may indeed be regarded as a moral duty : things have a right to be understood, and man, in Ruskin's words, " was made to understand the world, and to act on his understanding ". It involves also, if Nature is spelt with a capital " N " and is thus personalized and becomes perhaps a deity, a study of the question " Why ? " as well as that " How ? " to which science tries to give the

answer: and for an answer to the "Why?" we shall naturally turn to the Bible and to the great religious teachers: Bible teaching has often been vitiated by turning it into an answer to the "How?", where it palpably fails. But Nature includes human nature, so that there is involved also the proper study of mankind, the apprehension of what Carlyle called "a certain ground-plan of human nature and life": the truths of Nature are to be found in human history from the beginning of time, and in the behaviour of men to-day: "history", it has been said, "explains why we do what we habitually do", and thus reveals important truth with which the mind must be stored. So we are called upon to study in school and university, the natural sciences, the truths of religion, and man's social, political, and spiritual development. These subjects are, of course, all taught, and it is thus that they acquire their justification.

The natural sciences should be unspecialized, at least in the earlier stages. We have suffered much from our traditional division of science as a school subject into physics, chemistry, and biology. What is wanted for all boys is a

course in general science: this may well be divided into three terms' work—the first mainly astronomical, the second mainly geological, and the third dealing with life. In this way acquaintance may be made with the universe around us, and acquaintance not less important with the scientific method of induction and deduction: if once that method can be grasped, and can be recognized as identical with that whereby we make our day-to-day judgments on experience, a valuable lesson in accurate thinking is learnt. Later on, of course, in this as in other subjects, concentrated study in a particular field will be carried out: but that is much more the business of the university than of the school. It is here, perhaps, above all that the tendency for the university to throw advanced work back upon the school is to be regretted. The amount of specialization needed to win a science scholarship at one of the older universities is excessive and destructive of all true education: our distinguished scientists of the future are likely to be uneducated human beings, and every headmaster knows, even to-day, how difficult it is, in making an appointment to

his science side, to find a candidate with the desirable breadth of mind, width of sympathy, and human interests. If, however, unspecialized work in science, as suggested above, is allowed in schools, a foundation of essential knowledge for the future citizen will have been laid : he will understand something of his environment, and much of his knowledge, particularly in the biological sciences, he will be able to apply to current social problems : the nation's food-supply, housing, open spaces, population, the quality of the race, personal and social hygiene—these burning questions are all at bottom biological, and no man can think or act intelligently about them, unless he has had some biological training : and the grasp that that will give him of the interdependence of all living beings, so that all existence is seen to be a matter of give and take, may well be a force working for peace among nations. History and geography may make similar contributions, if history is taught always as the background of the present, and geography as the picture of a world in which men live and work in mutual dependence. It is sometimes suggested, and the experiment has indeed been

tried with success, that history should be taught backwards—that we should not begin with the Romans and Britons (as most of us did, and many got perhaps little farther), but should end with them: but whether so taught or not, the *teacher must be thinking backwards* all the time. He will find then that history constantly repeats itself, but never without a mutual explanation of past and present, and in that explanation it acquires its social value. Ancient history will thus be as valuable as Modern, and it will always, of course, be world history: even when it inevitably becomes national, it will be national history standing out from a world background. If these aims are to be achieved, much reform of our traditional methods will be necessary: English history has been for many a year and for many a teacher a story not of a people, but of personages, not of ordinary men and women, but of captains and kings: a story of battles won (preferably on the playing-fields of Eton), and not of those far more instructive battles lost: an island story, cut off by the seas from the continents of humanity, and not the weaving of the fabric of mankind's life on

the loom of time, with our own golden streak, sometimes tarnished, beautifying the pattern : a story ending about 1815, and not the inevitable breeding ground of 1914 to 1936. So much must be reformed, and the reforms have, of course, begun. It is sometimes suggested that our text-books should be re-written in the interests of internationalism : re-written, perhaps, they may be, but never, it is to be hoped, in the interests of internationalism or any other "ism", but solely in the interests of truth : for truth alone is the teacher's aim. Linked up with such history teaching, there must be geography teaching conceived in the same spirit : it will be a study of environment, first in our own home town or village, extending thence to the British Isles, to Europe, and to the world at large—emphasizing always the social element, the ways in which men live and communicate with one another and depend upon one another's activities for their daily bread. "Geography", writes Professor Fleure, "gives the teacher special opportunities to help the future citizen to build up what may be one of his most valuable possessions, a vision of the world

in which he will work to live, and in which other men in other circumstances also work to live, with methods and aims different from his own, but worthy of respectful study and appreciation so long as the aggressive spirit in political and in economic matters is kept under control and men's faces are set towards a goal of concord in liberty." The same ideals will colour our teaching of modern languages. "The proper study of mankind is *man*"—not his alphabet, nor his grammatical inflexions, nor his syntactical forms, but the man himself as he speaks his language: and I conceive that the real objective in the teaching of languages, is not the ability to speak the language fluently (which anyhow cannot be taught at school), nor even to read it intelligently and to write it accurately: these are but means to an end, incidental to the real aim of *understanding the people* whose language it is. In those ways the curriculum may be adapted to meet the demands of intelligent citizenship. I have said nothing of the direct teaching of current affairs, though indirectly much will have been taught: and it may be thought that I have strayed far from Huxley's

"great and fundamental truths of Nature and of the laws of her operations"; but these are fundamental truths of that humanity which is a part of Nature, and for a boy to grasp them, will be to fulfil another of Huxley's ideals—for he will have learnt "to respect others as himself".

He must also "love all beauty, whether of Nature or of art". Was ever the need for that greater than it is to-day? A beauty-loving citizen seems to be a rare phenomenon in the twentieth century, and a beauty-loving community rarer still. We have moved from the country into the town, and when we return to the country we commonly take the town with us: and this urbanization destroys not only the beauty of Nature, smothering it under a rash of bungalows, petrol pumps, and uprooted wild flowers, but also the appreciation of Nature: there are many who prefer the wail of the wireless in their car to the song of the lark on some downland height, or the gramophone in the boat to the nightingale who is thereby silenced. And yet this preference is an artificially induced thing, and corresponds to no genuine and deeply felt human desire. It

is bred largely of ignorance, out of indifference, and the schools are much to blame. " Education ", says Chesterton, " has meant the teaching of town things to country people, who did not want to learn them. I suggest that education should now mean the teaching of country things to town people, who do want to learn them." This is wise advice to school teachers. If we can teach an understanding and an appreciation of the land everlasting, we shall inculcate a respect for Nature: no man can have much to do with birds or beasts or flowers without respecting Nature: and that which we respect, we do not ruin. This is the only effective way of saving the countryside: the other ways—Ribbon Development Bills, the National Trust, the Council for the Preservation of Rural England—are but palliatives. And to save the countryside is not a mere matter of sentiment: it is a paramount civic duty. Can any great people dwell in sordid surroundings? and we are making England more sordid every day. After the beauties of Nature, the beauties of art. Art is at its best when it is the expression of the genius and the sense of beauty of *the whole community*: it begins

to deteriorate as soon as it becomes the business of the individual in revolt against the community: and with the decline of art goes the decline of the body politic. Art may be taken to include music and literature, and the cultured community must be the product of the schools. There is a call here for a renewed insistence on the humanities in education—not as more or less useless frills, but as an essential equipment for the citizen. It means that art must no longer be regarded as an extra, or relegated as it is in most examination syllabuses to a position of no value: it means that music must no longer be the concern only of the skilled instrumentalist, but rather a compulsory subject in broadest outline for every boy and girl: it means that literature must be studied no longer in the small text-book, which has been aptly described as the enemy of education, but in wider sweeps and in a more generous spirit, left to explain itself without notes: it means a particular attention in all teaching of the Classics to classical *art*, which is within the grasp of all, whether capable of learning Latin and Greek or not, and not so much attention to the minutiae of textual

criticism: it means making the whole school responsible, whether through choice of pictures or through original work, for the decoration of its class-rooms and premises. Only so can we hope to combat the invasion of vulgarity into our common life, to teach our boys and girls "to hate all vileness", and to produce a society which shall be, like the society of the Greek City State of the fifth century B.C., a unity of intelligence, aesthetic appreciation, and public spirit.

We are left with the moral and spiritual qualities in Huxley's definition—the "life and fire", the "passions trained to come to heel by a vigorous will", the "tender conscience". Can these virtues be taught? That question, which was discussed by Plato in the *Meno* and answered there with a qualified negative—they come, he thought, by some divine dispensation, but assisted by a recollection of the eternal types laid up in heaven—that question is still a burning question for every educator. There is little doubt that in any good school they are largely caught—caught from the common life with its personal responsibilities, its indoctrination of the larger

loyalties, its system of rewards and punishments (only justifiable if modelled on the system which obtains in life), its conscious and unconscious discipline, its exacting standards of right and wrong, its constant demands for self-abnegation in some wider interest, its sense of honour, and its sensitiveness to the unworthy. But it has already been pointed out in the chapter on the Church that these virtues, if they are to be more than transitory accommodations to the demands of the community, require not only inculcation but explanation : and the explanation is the business of the teacher of religion. His is an extremely difficult task. No ethical system can stand without a religious foundation, and a religious foundation involves a theology : yet it is true to say that except when a school has been founded in some particular denominational interest, it is no place for denominational teaching. The schoolmaster's business is not to supply a ready-made faith, but the stuff out of which the fabric of a personal faith can be woven later on. That means an open-minded approach to religious questions. But here, too, there is a danger :

the approach may be so open-minded as to leave the impression that this is after all only a matter of opinion, and that one opinion is as good as another or indeed as no opinion at all: and our boys and girls may leave school equipped with all the tackle for the voyage of life except an anchor. The only way to meet this difficulty is for the teacher to combine with his exposition of the various avenues of the spirit his deep and palpable conviction of the truth as he sees it—

"Stand thou on that side, for on this am I."

People will cry out against this on the grounds of bias, and there is no doubt that bias will be there, and that he will unconsciously influence many to adopt his position: but that must be risked in the interests of religion as an indispensable force in life. The place for this work will often be in the school services, though with senior pupils it will also enter into class-room teaching. But the bulk of that will be given to the teaching of the Bible, of which boys and girls from almost every home are to-day completely ignorant: its place at home is taken by Sunday cinemas and Sunday golf. And we shall teach the Bible, not as a

divine book, written as it were with the golden pen of God, but as the library of a divinely-inspired people, with a genius approached by no other people for seeking after God and finding Him : a progressive library, leading out of the mists and darkness of early superstition into the growing light of the prophets and thinkers of the old dispensation, till the sun rises in the New Testament to shine with increasing light and warmth in the later religious experiences of mankind. This library contains, moreover, literary material of every kind—folk-lore and battle-songs, history and mythology, romance and fiction, diaries and sermons, philosophy and drama, hymns and letters, and is to be read as any library would be read : " it was ", says Bishop Westcott, " because I have always tried to read the Bible like any other book, that I came to the conclusion it was unlike any other book in the world." It will not be easy to achieve this : time is an enemy, prejudices will have to be fought, and publishers will have to be convinced (for the average school Bible looks unlike any other book that was every published, and far less attractive than most). Not an easy task, but

it is necessary if we are to introduce our children to the greatest spiritual documents of all time, and to give them the material for a religious faith. That will be our main teaching. For the rest we shall endeavour, as I have already suggested, so to interfuse the religious and the secular in all our activities that this life shall be seen to be no fool's paradise or fool's hell, but to be full of divine significance in every particular, a fitting forecourt to habitations not made with hands.

These, then, are the ways we should pursue to reach the goal of a liberal education for an effective citizen. They are mainly *indirect* roads to citizenship. I have suggested nowhere, for instance, that citizenship or, to give it its popular title " Civics ", should be a subject added to the curriculum : there is no room for any additional subject, and such a subject, if it is to be fairly taught, will need a number of teachers of varying views, and will at best tend to become self-conscious : it is possible that for senior boys and girls in their last year something along these lines should be attempted, and a curriculum might be framed to include such subjects as elementary economics,

statistical mathematics, current affairs, architecture and town-planning, and social hygiene. But for the most part it is better to draw out the lessons of citizenship from a little world which is the image of the great and from those subjects which our experience has taught us are most truly educational. There will be many difficulties to contend with, and many temptations to be set aside. One of the chief difficulties will be examinations, a necessary evil to which no adequate alternative has yet been found, but too often the enemy of liberal education. Instruments will be offered to us promising a short cut and an easy path to success: the cinema and the wireless are such, threatening to turn a class into auditors and spectators, and not workers: "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only" should be written over every class-room, and remembered by every teacher who is inclined to teach too much: the best teacher is the one who most successfully effaces himself. For to learn to work is one of the prime lessons of school, with the corollary that all true labour is honourable, however uncongenial. With this in mind, self-help—in the matter, for instance,

of the making of cricket pitches—will be much more encouraged than it is in most schools. It will be readily seen how all the other normal activities of school life will play their part : games and the Cadet Corps and Boy Scouts : holiday exchanges and summer schools with boys and girls from abroad : lectures and expeditions and entertainments. All will play their part in teaching the future citizens to learn, in teaching them to think, in teaching them to work, and in teaching them the art of living together. And to be able to learn and go on learning all one's life : to be able to think and go on thinking all one's life : to be willing to work, with the consciousness that it is work only that dignifies a man : and to have mastered the art of living together, with all sorts and conditions of men, in a world that is rapidly shrinking—these four are the prime qualifications for effective citizenship, for meeting the reasonable demands of society, and for the production of one who may style himself, without qualification, a human being.

CHAPTER VI

THE TRAINING OF THE TEACHER

CHAPTER VI

THE TRAINING OF THE TEACHER

WE have studied the various impersonal forces—the home, the Church, the school, and the university—which are engaged in making citizens, and we now come to the personal factor, to the teacher himself. We may recall the words of Guizot in introducing an Education Bill to the French Chamber of Deputies in 1833: "All the provisions hitherto described would be of no effect if we took no pains to procure for the school thus constituted an able master worthy of the high vocation of instructing the people. It cannot be too often repeated that it is the master that makes the school." To this we may add that it is the parent who makes the home, and the priest who makes the Church. The question of how to train the parent or the priest for their educational functions, is an interesting and important one: but it cannot be dealt

with here. I would only say this about the parent: as a schoolmaster I have often felt that the education of fathers and mothers is as important as the education of their sons: many a man and his wife are genuinely anxious to play their part as teachers, and are prepared to make any sacrifices and to take any amount of trouble: but they fail (and nobody bewails their failure more than themselves) through sheer ignorance of how to set about the task. Any help that could be given them from any source—whether in the form of books, pamphlets, lectures, parents' associations, or in any other way—would be warmly welcomed. As for the training of the priest, some observations on the subject have been made in the third chapter, and to these I would only add that if it were possible for him to have some years' experience in other walks of life before taking his Orders, I believe he would be much more competent for the problems which will confront him: I hold the same view, as will be seen, with regard to the professional teacher.

To the professional teacher, then, we now turn. The teaching profession is in a unique

position among professions, for no qualifications are necessary for its practice. This is a strange social phenomenon. We do not allow unqualified doctors to prescribe for a cold in the nose or a stomach-ache, nor do we allow unqualified dentists to stop a tooth: but we allow unqualified teachers to operate at will on the minds and characters of our children: it is presumably a less important matter than the other. No man may put up his plate as a doctor or dentist until he has satisfied the statutory or professional requirements: but there is nothing to prevent a man from putting up his plate as a schoolmaster. This is done, indeed, by unqualified persons to an alarming extent: the number of private schools (generally called "colleges"—a suspicious title), unrecognized by any responsible body and uninspected, which are springing up particularly in the neighbourhood of big cities, is surprising and disturbing—the more so, as such schools generally manage to succeed. The reason is not far to seek. In any growing suburb the speculative builder builds houses and not schools: and when those houses are inhabited, as they are almost as quickly as they

can be built, the education of the children becomes a serious problem. It is likely that the provided schools are too far distant, involving possibly a dangerous journey across the high roads : and it is certain that, distant or not, there will be many people whose very moving into the suburb means a step up in the social ladder, and who for that reason alone will not send their children to the local elementary or secondary school. The way is thus clear for the speculative teacher, following hard on the heels of the speculative builder : and he takes one of the latter's desirable residences, designates it a "college", and rakes in the pupils and the shekels. He need have no university degree and no training certificate, and frequently he has neither. This problem can be solved partly by Government action, making every school liable to inspection, and partly by the teachers themselves : the Royal Society of Teachers (founded as the "Teachers' Registration Council" largely by that great educationalist Sir John McClure) is a step in the right direction, and it is to be hoped that all teachers will in due time appreciate the importance, in the interests

of their profession and of the public which they serve, of registering themselves as members of this body.

Meanwhile, we must realize that there exists this large army of unqualified teachers. Fortunately the number of those who are qualified is vastly greater. The tale of their qualifications is an intricate and a various one. Our system of training teachers, if system it may be called, has grown up, like so many other things in this country, in a haphazard way, and it bears all the signs of its haphazard growth. It has had much opposition to contend with, and it meets with much opposition to-day. The whole idea of training a teacher is anathema to some: teachers, they will tell us, are born and not made: that, of course, is true, but if there are not enough born teachers to go round (which is highly probable), the others have to be made: and to the born teacher himself we may point out that artists also and poets are born, not made, yet neither despises mastering the technique of his craft: it appears that even surrealist art and modern poetry have a technique to be learnt. But in the meantime

many a headmaster, self-made himself (I quote from the *Times Educational Supplement*), " tends to think that his own career proves that extraneous aids are unnecessary and possibly even hampering to success. Of self-made men in general it has been well observed that their claim often absolves the Creator from a heavy responsibility. Where a self-made teacher insists on his ability to make teachers like himself, he is forcing his colleagues into a groove and making it difficult for them to adjust themselves to the different conditions which they will certainly find in other schools. A teacher should be a professional person, something more than the appanage of a particular school or even of a particular type of school." We have heard enough of the self-made teacher. Another frequent complaint is that granting training to be desirable, yet the courses are not on the right lines, that much has to be unlearnt afterwards, and that the time is largely wasted : that also is true up to a point, but once grant the principle, and our business becomes to improve the courses, not to abandon the whole idea. I

propose in what remains to examine the present system, and to suggest some improvements that might be made.

In our elementary schools there are various grades of teachers with varying degrees of training : there are certificated teachers, some of whom have passed through a training college while others have obtained the Board of Education Certificate while actually engaged in teaching : there are uncertificated teachers, who are partially trained : there are student teachers, who are in the early stages of their training : there are supplementary teachers, all women, untrained, but regarded as "suitable" : and there are teachers of special subjects, who have all been trained in their subject, though not perhaps in the teaching of it. In secondary schools the great majority of teachers are university graduates, but have had no professional training : it is in this department, indeed, that our system of training is most inadequate. The types of training available, excluding certain special cases, may be considered as two. There is first the two-year course in a training college : this is the course taken by most elementary

school teachers, and may follow directly on a full secondary school course, or may be preceded by a year's student-teachership between the two: to this course there is sometimes added a third year, perhaps after an interval of teaching, for the advanced study of a special subject. Secondly, there is the four-year course, comprising three years for a university degree and one post-graduate year, either in a university training department or in a secondary training college, for an education diploma. There are, of course, many variations on these two courses, but these cover substantially most of the training given to teachers in this country. Without going into details of the content of the courses, certain general criticisms may be offered. The two-year course has a notoriously low standard of entry, and consequently of achievement. This is partly due to the system of scholarships and special grants for intending teachers: these, which are available both for a university course and for post-graduate work in a university department, by offering means for an education which might otherwise be impossible, attract into the profession many

unsuitable candidates. The remedy is to have no special grants earmarked for teachers, but to increase the general scholarships, open to all alike, at all stages. Meanwhile, one result is that in many training colleges general education, which is inadequate at the time of entry, has to be proceeded with concurrently with professional training—to the detriment of the latter. Little time is left for specialization and for the advanced study of some particular subject: and when this is achieved, it is commonly not recognized in the elementary school to which the student returns: such schools are still wedded to the idea, for which there is much to be said and which circumstances sometimes render inevitable, of the class teacher of all subjects. Moreover, in these colleges something of a vicious circle is apt to be set up. Originally they were staffed by ex-elementary school teachers, they received their students from the elementary schools, and to those schools they sent them back: and though both staff and students are now drawn partly from the secondary schools, and though in theory the colleges prepare their students for work in

any type of school, still the old circle is still there, and these institutions remain institutions apart, and their students segregated from the main currents of life. That is not good practice in citizenship, nor is it good education for the future trainer of the citizen. The four-year course may also be criticized in certain points. It may be questioned whether an honours school is the best preliminary education for *all* teachers. Many will regard this as a dangerous heresy: but apart from the fact that there are undoubtedly some "born teachers" who are not capable of taking such a school, the work demanded is often of too specialized and too academic a nature, while the successful candidate, who obtains perhaps a First Class, stamps himself as a good learner though not necessarily a good teacher: he may in fact know too much. An example of a too highly specialized honours school for the prospective teacher may be found in the Modern Languages School of Oxford University. But when graduation is over, the content of the course that follows is not wholly satisfactory. The most satisfactory part of it is the term's practical experience at a

selected school, and it may be suggested that university training departments should establish closer touch with the particular types of school for which they are training their students. A good deal of the syllabus is too theoretical, and too much attention and time is given to method: of teaching it is more true than of most other activities, that you can only learn by doing, and method can only be studied in a class-room with a class of boys and girls before you. There is, moreover, a vicious circle here too, though it is not the fault of the training department: too many of our public schools are staffed too exclusively by public school men: their life history is public school—university—public school, and they know little of any world other than that. That vicious circle needs breaking, no less than the vicious circle in the training colleges.

So I pass from the critical to the constructive part of what I have to say. In the first place, it would be a good thing if we could find some other phrase than the "Training of Teachers". It has undesirable associations and limitations. We associate the idea of training with animals:

we train dogs and monkeys to perform tricks, but neither the methods nor the results are those we would imitate in preparing the future educators of the nation. With animals we know beforehand what is the trick we want, we use bribery and fear to achieve our end, and any intellectual process (if that is possible) on the part of the trainee jeopardizes our success: it is a purely automatic response to a particular stimulus. The very reverse is true of our relations with future teachers: there are few, if any, tricks of the trade to be learnt, and the belief that there are and that to undergo a course of training means primarily to pick up some "useful tips" has had a most harmful effect; moreover, such tricks as there are, had better be learnt in the course of teaching: we do not want to suggest (even if it were true) that to take a course of training will keep a teacher in his post, while to neglect it will damage his chances, and that the whole thing has a purely utilitarian value: and we *do* want to encourage to the utmost free and independent thought about the whole business of education; indeed that, as will be seen, should form the fundamental part of any

course. Let us, then, try to get away from the idea of "training", with its unfortunate associations. Let us at the same time beware of the limitations inherent in the term "teacher". It smacks of "usherdom", of the class-room, the blackboard, the text-book, and the whole wretchedly narrow world of mere instruction, bounded by a bell at the beginning and the end. But we have to-day a much wider conception of what we expect in those to whom we entrust our children: it is a big world in which we see them move, and the class-room is only a small corner of it: the bell does not mark the beginning or the end, but merely punctuates a task which, in school and out, never ends till the end of term—and often not even then: teaching, in the accepted sense, is but a small part of the modern "teacher's" task. The "training of teachers" is altogether too limiting a description, and every department concerned with such work should regard itself as primarily a department of *education*. It is, however, difficult to find a more satisfactory phraseology, and with that warning we may perhaps use the traditional terms.

It will probably be agreed that there should be no unqualified teachers, but that a university degree or a training college course —or preferably both—should be a necessary preliminary to the work of a schoolmaster or schoolmistress. This might be ensured by compulsory registration, with corresponding privileges, in the Royal Society of Teachers. Such a step would do much, not only for the efficiency and the solidarity of the profession, but also for the protection of the public against unqualified practitioners. It may be argued that preliminary training of such a kind—particularly when the professional part of it follows a university course—will be too expensive both in time and money. But to that we would answer that we are concerned with ideals, and that where there is a will there is a way : nor would it be irrelevant to point out that no complaints are raised on the ground that training for the medical profession is too long or too expensive : and yet we are concerned with a more important thing than the body. It should be regarded as the business of the State (for this is a national work and not a local concern) to see that such training is

carried out, and this should be done in co-operation with the universities : indeed this seems to be a proper function of a university, and ultimately all training institutions should be connected, more or less closely, with a university : the particular degree of association would vary with local circumstances : at present there are four possible forms of association —either as a constituent college of the university, or as a recognized department, or as qualifying to enter students for certain university examinations, or as subject to inspection and examination by a university body : the last is the loosest, as the first is the closest, form of connection, and it need only be added that the closer the connection the better. This would have the effect of doing away with some of the abuses of our present system—particularly in the training of teachers for elementary schools : it would break the present vicious circle, and by associating prospective teachers, through their university life, with students in other walks of life, would widen their horizons and bring to an end the present unfortunate segregation : it is important, in this connection, that teachers for

all types of schools should for as long as possible be trained together, though it is recognized that some degree of specialization would be necessary in the final stages. The university influence would also result in an immeasurable raising of the standards all round (which is badly needed), and would probably attract to the profession recruits from a much wider field (another badly needed reform). The stages in the preparation of a teacher for his work should be three: first, his general preliminary education; second, his professional training; and third, a probationary period as a full-time teacher. Preliminary education should in no circumstances be less than a full secondary school course, and for as many as possible, and for all teachers in secondary schools, a university course on the top of that: nor should any promises be exacted before the professional stage, nor any grants or scholarships be awarded, binding the student to adopt the teaching profession: provision should rather be made by an increase of scholarships and grants open to all without discrimination. There follows the stage of professional training. I wish to put the ideal,

while recognizing that for some time it will probably be necessary to maintain the two-year course, with its somewhat limited scope, for elementary school teachers, reserving the four-year course for secondary school work. Ideally, however, all should follow the four-year course, and with necessary modifications the content of it should be the same for all. And first, the student must be encouraged to *think about* education. He will have little time to do this when once his work starts.

> What is this life if, full of care,
> We have no time to stand and stare?

The schoolmaster, full of care to guarantee five credits in the School Certificate Examination, will have little time to stand and stare at the real goal that is set before him, and will only too easily mistake the nearer objective for the final. This means a study of objectives: it means sitting down with one's books and seeing whither the great thinkers of all time and all countries have judged that education should lead. I would go back to Plato, and study the scheme of education expounded in the *Republic*: indeed, one of the best text-books

for the would-be teacher is Nettleship's Essay on that subject (recently re-published by the Clarendon Press in a single volume). I would study the subject also in the works of Milton, Locke, Rousseau, and Herbert Spencer, as well as in the books of contemporary writers whom it would be invidious to name. From such a study, though the goal might present itself in different guise to different students, a certain vision would result, and without vision a school, no less than a people, perishes. With this there should go a survey of the national system—with enough of the history of education (and no more, for this is apt to become little more than an examination subject) to make that intelligible: it would mean a study of the growth of education, with the successive Acts of Parliament, from the early thirties of the nineteenth century, so that the powers of the Board of Education and the Local Authorities may be grasped, and the various types of teaching institutions—from nursery schools to adult schools—fitted into the pattern: the teacher would then enter upon his work, not as an isolated unit in an isolated school, but as a co-operator in a great national

movement. Then there come psychology, and the theory of knowledge. Much of these, however, is probably better left for a later stage, for study in a vacation course after some experience of teaching has been obtained; in the earlier stages psychology needs to be concrete rather than theoretical, scientific rather than philosophical, and social rather than individual. In this way it can be linked up with physiology and social science, which are of more value. A study of the general characters of living organisms, of their reaction to their environment, of the particular environment of the child, of the conditions for healthy physical life and development both at home and at school, and of the particular responsibilities of the teacher in these matters—such a study must surely form an indispensable part of any course of training. It is important also that the would-be teacher should give some attention to contemporary world politics—to the great movements, such as Communism or Fascism, which are shaping the destinies of mankind: so that he may have an intelligent understanding of these, set free from the prejudice and the false associations

to which most of us fall victims. It means a study of the World of To-day and To-morrow—that world for which he is preparing his pupils—to make or to mar it.

To all this I should join physical education, both practical and theoretical, as a subject in the curriculum: that would be in the interests of the teacher, no less than in the interests of the schools: the schools to-day suffer in this respect from a lack of trained teachers—boys' schools more than girls' schools: for girls' schools there are perhaps half a dozen physical training colleges, for boys' schools nothing beyond the Carnegie Physical Training College at Leeds. The best teacher of this subject is one who can combine it with other subjects: he thus keeps his interests and his sympathies wide, and makes provision for the years after forty or so when he will have to give up his active work as a physical instructor: and there is likely in the near future to be an increasing demand for teachers competent to undertake this work as part of their duties. And with physical education I would associate some skill-demanding and skill-producing activity. The work of hobbies in schools, and the

encouragement of them, is much handicapped by a lack of teachers capable of directing them and of showing the way: and if some hobby training could be a part of every teacher's course, so that he could use perhaps his hands and be a skilled creator of beautiful and useful things, it would not only be a great joy to him, but would supply a marked deficiency in our present educational equipment. Finally, there is practice in suitable schools, and this is likely to be the most valuable part of the course: the more of this for which time and opportunity can be found, the better. It will mean university training departments being in close contact with a large number of schools of all types, so that their students may get their experience in that type of school which they are ultimately most likely to enter: and the experience should consist of observation of a skilled teacher, practice under his supervision, and finally independent teaching.

It might fairly be argued that the outline I have given, particularly if the practical experience is to occupy any length of time, would constitute too heavy a burden for a post-graduate course. Much, however, has

been omitted that commonly forms part of such courses—the detailed history of education, and methodology, for instance. But if more time is needed, I would greatly daring suggest that it might be gained by shortening the degree course. I have already given reasons for thinking that for many teachers, and especially for those who are not going to be specialists, a full honours course of three years is neither suitable nor desirable: and I believe that as an alternative to that a two-year degree course, based on the Oxford Group system, might profitably be considered, thus leaving two years for professional training.[1] Such a plan would need very careful consideration, for it is highly important that the academic standards of teachers should not be lowered: they should, indeed, be raised: but for most of those whose standard is at present too low a two-year degree course would represent a real advance, while the full

[1] If this plan were followed, it might be possible to include a short testing period, perhaps of three or six months, in the professional course. Such would be invaluable, and if taken at the beginning of the course as a part-time teacher in a school, would have the effect of eliminating unsuitable candidates before they had gone too far: there are few more tragic fates than that of the school teacher who has mistaken his profession: I have seen such completely broken down at the end of a day's work.

course could be maintained for specialist teachers in the higher forms of secondary schools.

After training is finished, there should follow a year of probationary service. This is, indeed, the practice in many schools already, and though, if a testing time had been satisfactorily passed, it would be less necessary than it is under present conditions, it would still be a wise precaution. Such probationary service might well be carried out in a school of a different type from that which is ultimately to be entered: it is, for instance, highly profitable for the prospective teacher in a public boarding school to serve first in a secondary day school, or vice versa: and often the experiment has been tried with success of arranging for a newly-appointed master to spend a year teaching in some school abroad before taking up his position. All this aims at the widening of horizons, at getting into our schools men and women who will be citizens of the world, as well as citizens of the small community to which they belong. This same end can be served in other ways. In particular it is high time that in making our

appointments we should set some store by experience gained in other spheres than the teaching world, and that such experience should count for salary and pension purposes. The most valuable kind of experience would probably be experience in some form of social service—as manager of a boys' club, in after-care work, in welfare work, or as a teacher in a Juvenile Unemployment Centre. We are often urged, and rightly urged, to bring up our boys and girls with a sense of the importance of social service, and an understanding of their responsibility in the matter: the master who alone can succeed in doing that is he who has himself done the work. He would himself have played the part of a citizen, and would have seen his fellow-citizens at work and play: for these reasons, and as a man older and more experienced than the general run of newly-appointed masters, he would be an invaluable recruit to the ranks of those who are trying to train citizens.

It is, however, after he has begun teaching that a teacher really finds training most helpful. He then has experience behind him: he knows what are the pitfalls, and where his

own particular weaknesses lie: he is in a position to benefit from the experience of others: and above all he knows what he wants to learn. It is for this reason that vacation courses are so valuable, and are increasingly used by all ranks of teachers. They deal generally each with a particular subject, and even a teacher of long experience may profit by the opportunity of bringing himself up to date in his subject and keeping abreast of the work that is being done on it. But they suffer from certain weaknesses. One is that they are interested more in the subject than in the presentation of it, and they tend to draw together groups of specialists in the subject, rather than groups of teachers of all subjects: it is contact with other teachers, primarily interested not in mathematics or in history but in *teaching*, that is needed. Another weakness is that they are *vacation* courses. School teachers, particularly in certain grades, seem to enjoy long holidays, and are sometimes the envy of business men for that reason: but the exacting nature of the work, and in boarding schools the unremitting demands that it makes, render long holidays necessary if a

CHAPTER VII

THE GOAL: *CIVITAS DEI*

CHAPTER VII

THE GOAL: *CIVITAS DEI*

IN this short survey of education as a social factor we have considered the main educational agencies of our time, the home, the Church, the school, and the university, with the part to be played by each, and have given some thought to the preparation of the men and women to whom we would entrust the making of our citizens. Citizenship has throughout been kept in the forefront, and I append a brief chapter on the real goal that is set before us: and that goal I do not hesitate to describe as *Civitas Dei*. That at once gives a religious aspect to the work of education, and that is as it should be. When we speak of the teacher's "calling" in the same sense as when we speak of the priest's calling, we are abundantly justified in using the term: "Here am I; send me" is the teacher's answer to the question, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" no less than the minister's of

God. Religion and education are intimately associated: education has been described as "the handmaid of religion", and religion as "education raised to its highest power": and both have for their aim the establishment of the Kingdom of God upon earth. It is, therefore, no merely temporal citizenship of this world that we have in mind, when we speak of education as a social factor. Some years ago this question was asked in a paper on the Theory, History, and Practice of Education set for the Education Diploma in a University Department: "Are there any dangers involved in making good citizenship the aim of an educational system?" The answer to that question clearly depends on the interpretation that is given to good citizenship. It may be interpreted in a narrow political sense, as it is in the modern totalitarian State: the good citizen is then the efficient cog in the political machine, and all his education must be directed to ensure his efficiency: with that end in view, history must if necessary be re-written, the world re-mapped, science re-directed, morality re-interpreted, religion re-orientated, truth must be sacrificed

to *the* truth. The dangers of an educational system devoted to such an end are patent enough. It is not so that we in this country interpret good citizenship, and it has not so been interpreted in this book. It is rather, as I indicated at the outset, a two-fold citizenship that has been in view, such a citizenship indeed as every man is bound by the laws of his being to exercise. There is for each one of us a citizenship of the Kingdom of God and a citizenship of the kingdom of men, and it is the business of education to prepare us for both alike—to render unto God the things that are God's, and unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. Our acts as citizens must have reference to a social end, but they must no less have reference to a divine end. "Whatever act of thine", says Marcus Aurelius, "has no reference either immediately or remotely to a social end, this tears asunder thy life, and does not allow it to be one." That is true enough, but what he says in another of his Meditations is equally true: "As physicians have always their instruments and their knives ready for cases which suddenly require their skill, so do thou have principles ready for the

understanding of things divine and human, even the smallest, with a recollection of the bond which unites the divine and human to one another. For neither wilt thou do anything well which pertains to man without at the same time having a reference to things divine; nor the contrary." That puts the matter in a nutshell, and though the citizenship may appear two-fold, it is seen on reflection to be in reality single: such is the interpenetration of the two kingdoms, that we daily and hourly cross the frontier without being aware of what we have done: there are no barriers to trade or to travel, and no passports are needed: the same tongue is spoken on both sides of the frontier; we hear it in the utterances of Jesus, and whenever a kind word is spoken, the note of sympathy sounded, or a vision of the truth put into words: we hear it in the music of the spheres, in the song of the birds, and in a symphony of Beethoven: it is the language of the saints, and is spoken by all those who have won the freedom of the United Kingdom of Heaven and Earth. It is a citizen for that United Kingdom whom I have had in mind: a man with a God-given

personality—body, mind, and spirit—to be worked into the divine pattern for human existence, realizing himself in order to give himself: rooted in the fundamental virtues of family life, which have been the seed-plot of all that is best in human experience: finding the authority which he craves, the sanctification of morality, and the standards to apply to social well-being, in a conception of God immanent in all activity and blending in one the secular and the religious: believing in himself with a work to do, and a contribution to make—taught to live in harmony with his surroundings, but to rebel against them when the need arises: with a body educated to exercise its skill and to create beauty, an intellect trained to think clearly and accurately, a mind stored with a knowledge of God as He works in the universe and in the lives of men: a lover of all beauty, and a hater of all vileness: with a developed conscience, a disciplined will, and a divine discontent: seeing all the things that men have done and all the things that men do *sub specie aeternitatis*. Such is the citizen of the United Kingdom, and if he is to proceed from our schools and universities,

nothing less than *Civitas Dei* is the goal of education. He alone can save the world. We see every day how ineffective is human machinery, how unavailing are pacts and agreements, how immoral are corporate societies—and the Sovereign State most immoral of all: where an individual will behave like an angel, the State will behave like a fiend. *Moral Man and Immoral Society* is the title of a book by Niebuhr, and the prime task of moral man is to transform immoral society, to make civilization not, as Niebuhr says, "a device for delegating the vices of individuals to larger and larger communities", but a device for delegating their virtues, to prevent the transmutation by patriotism of individual unselfishness into national egoism, and to make patriotism its transmutation into *national* unselfishness. This can only be done from within. "No democracy can exist", I have read, "unless it has within itself an aristocracy sufficiently powerful and informed to direct general opinion"—and no free and full life for humanity at large can be achieved without that. It is that aristocracy whom we would train, the leaven

which in time can leaven the whole lump—first raising the life of the small community, be it home, school, Church, business, profession, immediately around us, and then in ever-widening range till the vision of *Civitas Dei* becomes a reality, and we see amid the smoke and the chimney-stacks the pinnacles of the City of God. To produce such an aristocracy is a life-long task, and must ultimately be carried out by each man for himself. Education is a life-long process; and only he who on the edge of the grave can look back without remorse upon himself and the society which he has helped to fashion, and look forward without fear to that larger society for which he is bound, realizing that both these societies are indissolubly connected and that both form the communion of all saints and of all souls, only he may consider himself as educated in all citizenship.